# THE HISTORY OF Infant-Baptism,

IN TWO PARTS.

The First being

An impartial Collection of all ſuch Paſſages in the Writers of the four firſt Centuries as do make FOR, or AGAINST IT.

The Second,

Containing ſeveral things that do illuſtrate the ſaid Hiſtory.

By W. Wall, Vicar of Shoreham in Kent.

*LONDON,*

Printed by *J. Downing*, for *R. Sympſon* at the *Harp*, and *H. Bonwick* at the *Red-Lion* in St. *Paul's-Church-Yard.* 1705.

THE

# HISTORY

OF

# Infant-Baptism,

BEING

An impartial Collection of all ſuch Paſſages in the Writers of the four firſt Centuries as do make FOR, or AGAINST IT.

PART I.

By W. Wall, Vicar of Shoreham in Kent.

*LONDON.*

Pirinted by *J. Downing*, for *R. Sympſon* at the *Harp*, and *H. Bonwick* at the *Red-Lion* in St. *Paul's-Church-Yard*, 1705.

# THE PREFACE.

*Forasmuch as the Commission given by our Saviour to his Disciples, in the time of his mortal Life, to baptize in the Country of* Judea, *is not at all set down in Scripture; only it is said, that they baptized* (1) *a great many: And the Enlargement of that Commission given 'em afterwards,* Mat. 28. 19. *to perform the same Office among all the* Heathen *Nations, is set down in such brief Words, that there is no particular Direction given what they were to do in reference to the Children of those that received the Faith: And among all the Persons that are recorded as baptized by the Apostles, there is no express mention of any* Infant; *nor is there on the other side any Account of any* Christian's *Child, whose Baptism was put off till he was grown up, or who was baptiz'd at Man's Age: (for all the Persons that are mention'd in Scripture to have been baptized, were the Children of* Heathens, *or else of* Jews, *who did not believe in Christ at that time when those their Children were born). And since the Proofs drawn by Consequences from some places of Scripture, for any one side of this Question, are not so plain as to hinder the Arguments drawn from other places for the other side, from seeming still considerable to those that have no help from the History of the Scripture-Times for the better understanding of the Rules of Scripture: It is no wonder that the Readers of Scripture, at this distance from the Apostles times, have fallen into contrary Sentiments about the Meaning of our Savour's Command, and the*

(1) John 4. 1, 2. it. 3. 22, 26.

*Practice of the Apostles in reference to the baptizing of Infants.*

*But since the Practice of the ancient Christians that liv'd nigh the Times of the Apostles, being more largely deliver'd, is more easily known: that such as have gone about to give an Account thereof out of the ancient Records, should give so contrary Accounts as they do, is a great Wonder and a great Shame.*

*For they do not only differ in the Understanding of the meaning of several of the places produced; but also as to matter of Fact (whether they be rightly cited or not) do charge one another (2) with Forgery. And indeed among all the Books of Controversie between* Papists *and* Protestants, *or others, that are scandalous for false Quotations, there is none comparable to one that is written on this Occasion, which I shall at present forbear to name.*

(2) More Proofs for Infants ch. Membership & Baptism *p.* 346.

*Such a thing done by Mistake, or for want of Skill, is bad enough: but if it be done wilfully, it is hard to think of any thing that is a greater Wickedness: for it goes the way to destroy the common Faith of Mankind, by which we are apt to rely upon a Writer, that how zealous soever he may be for his Opinion, he will not forge Matters of Fact, nor* speak wickedly (*tho' it be*) for God, *as* Job *says*, (3)

(3) Job 13. 7.

*Some other Accounts also are very partial, mentioning only that which makes for their Side, and leaving out parts of the Clauses which they cite.*

*The Inconvenience of this is the worse, because it is in a Matter which would have a great Influence to settle and determine this unlucky Controversie; provided that the Accounts of the eldest Times were given fairly and impartially, and so that the Reader might be satisfied of the Truth and Impartiality of them.*

*For when there is in Scripture a plain Command to proselyte or make Disciples all Nations, baptizing 'em; but the Method of doing it is not in all Particulars expressly directed; it not being particularly mentioned whether they were to admit into this Discipleship and Baptism,*

*Baptism, the Infants of those that were converted, as the* Jewish *Church had always done to the Infants of Proselytes, (giving them Circumcision, as we know by Scripture, and Baptism as we are* (4) *assur'd by their Records) or whether they were to proceed in a new way, and baptize only the adult Persons themselves: there is no Body that will doubt but that the Apostles knew what was to be done in this Case: and consequently, that the Christian Churches in their time did as they should do in this matter.*

(4) See the Introduction.

*And since the Apostles liv'd, some of 'em, to near the End of the first Century, and St.* John *something beyond it; and had in their own time propagated the Christian Faith and Practice into so many Countries; it can never sink into the Head of any considering Man, but that such Christians as were ancient Men about* 100 *or* 150 *Years after that time of the Apostles Death, which is the Year of Christ* 200 *or* 250, *must easily know whether Infant-Baptism were in use at the time of the Apostles Death or not: because the Fathers of some of 'em, and Grandfathers of most of 'em were born before that time, and were themselves Infants in the Apostles Days, and so were baptiz'd then in their Infancy, if that were then the Order: or their Baptism deferred to adult Age, if that were the use then. For such a thing as the general Baptizing of Infants, being a Rite publick and notorious, and in which the whole Body of the People, Poor and Rich, Pastors and Laymen, Men and Women are concerned, cannot be forgotten in a short time, nor altered without a great deal of Noise. In a point of Doctrine deliver'd by Tradition, a Mistake may happen: or in the Account of some Matter of Fact done by some particular Man: But for a Rite of universal Concern, a whole Church cannot forget it, much less all the Churches in several Parts of the World in so short a time. We* Englishmen *cannot be ignorant whether Infants were usually baptized in* England *or not, in Queen* Elizabeth's *Days, which is the same distance. The Man that thinks this possible, is one that is not us'd to consider.*

*It is to be remembred likewise, that the Apostles before they died, chose Men of whom they had good Proof, to teach the Churches the same things that they had done; many of whom liv'd till a great while after the Apostles were dead: which makes the time that needs to be kept in memory so much the shorter.*

*Some pretend to slight this Argument, as not being a Scripture one: but it is that too by a direct Consequence. For since the Scripture promises that the Church shall be led into all Truth,* i. e. *all Truth that is necessary or fundamental; to follow the Example of the Primitive Church must be, by the Rule of Scripture, a sure way not to err in Fundamentals.*

(5) Unreasonableness of Separation, *p.* 226.

*It were (as Bp.* Stillingfleet *observes* (5) *in another Case*) a great Blot and Dishonour to Christian Religion, if the Primitive Churches could not hold to their first Institution, not for one Age after the Apostles; no not the purest and best Churches.

*But the Truth is, there is no Man that does really slight this Argument, tho' those that have no Skill in it, or do suspect that it will go against their side, will make as if they did. And therefore you shall see, both on the one side and on the other, those Men who, for a Flourish, do pretend that they lay small Stress on it, as having Proof enough from Scripture, yet take all the Pains possible to bring this Argument to bear on their side; and that so zealously, that they often do it unfairly. There is no Christian that loves to hear or to admit, that all the ancient Churches practis'd otherwise than he does in a controverted matter.*

*Seeing therefore that all the Arguments from Scripture for each side, have been so searched and so often handyed too and fro, that not much more can be said to illustrate'em: and that where a Command in Scripture is given in brief and general Words, the Practice of the Primitive Church thereupon gives us the best Direction for the Sense in which it is to be applied to particular Cases: And that a great many have desired to see the History of this Practice fully and fairly represented:*

*presented: I have thought it worth my Pains to draw up and publish such a Collection as is express'd in the Title.*

*And if any one ask, what there is done in this more than in others that have been already. I answer,*

1. *That the best Collections of this nature have not been published in the* English *Language: and it 'is for the use of* Englishmen *that this is intended.*

2. *That this is more compleat than any I have seen: because among those I have seen, each one omitted some Testimonies which the other had: and it is easy for one, that collects out of all of 'em, to have more than any one: beside that, no inconsiderable Number of these have been gather'd from my own Reading.*

*The first and best Collection that I have seen, is* Cassanders, *then* Vossius, *and of late, Dr.* Hammond's, *and out of him Mr.* Walker's. *The rest are mostly intermixt, by those that produce 'em, with their Proofs and Arguments from Scripture, and must be picked out: So there are many in the Books of* Calvin, Bullinger, Featly, Tombs, Marshall, Cobbet, Baxter, Danvers, Wills, *&c.*

3. *I pretend it to be more impartial than the rest: for most of them are Collections of such Quotations only as make for that side of the Question for which they are disputing. And here my Reader will say;* If those produc'd by you do make some for one side and some for the other, they will leave us in the same Ambiguity that they find us. *To which I must answer, that if he will come to the reading of 'em with the same resolved Impartiality, that I set my self to the writing of 'em, I believe he will find it otherwise. However, the only way to pass a true Judgment, is to see both together.*

4. *I have recited the Places more at large than others have done. One single Sentence, or (as they frequently cite) a bit or scrap of a Sentence, gives but a very imperfect, and oftentimes a mistaken Account*

of

*of the Author's Meaning: but the Context added shews the Tenor and Scope of his Discourse.*

*After all, I acknowledge that there are in the Books I mention'd, and others, several Quotations which I have not here: and the Reason is partly because I confine my self to Authors that liv'd and wrote within the first* four hundred *Years, (tho' some of them out-living that Term, wrote some of their Works after it): and that I do, because all Men of Reading know, that from that time to the time of the* Waldenses, *about the Year* 1150, *the Practice is unquestionable: and partly because many of the Quotations were false, and so alter'd, that when I came to search the Original, they was there nothing to the purpose: or they were out of spurious Books,* &c. *I have been forc'd to write one Chapter (6) of this Work to give an Account what sort of Quotations I have left out, and for what Reasons: And if any one will inform me of any Passage in any Author within the term limited, which he, after the reading of the said Chapter, shall yet judge to be to the purpose; I will, if I live to see any* Second Edition *of this mean Work, put it in (if it seem to me to be to the purpose): and that indifferently, whether it make* for, *or* against *Pædobaptism. For I desire that this Collection should be as compleat and impartial as may be. And it is for this Reason only, that I have put my Name to it, (that any one may have the Opportunity of advertising me of any Passage that I have omitted) intending otherwise, that the impartial Management should have left the Reader uncertain which Practice of the two I my self had own'd.*

(6) Part 2. CH. I.

*When I say in the Title* [Of all the Passages] *I do not pretend but that in St.* Austin *there are a great many more: but all to the same purpose. For he in his Disputes with the* Pelagians *has whole Books wherein he proves Original Sin from the Practice of Pædobaptism. In those I have only taken here and there a Piece: since every Body knows his Doctrine.*

*I have*

*I have recited the Originals of all the principal Quotations: because in this matter Writers have so accus'd one another of Forgery, or perverting of Testimonies by false Translations,* &c. *that People are grown distrustful: now they will be satisfy'd that if I have mistranslated any thing, I did not do it willingly: for then I should never have added the Author's own Words for the Discovery of it.*

*I have made two Parts of this Work. The first contains the principal Quotations with some Notes drawn from them. I have rejected all the spurious ones: only I have put a few of the most ancient of 'em together in the last Chapter. The two first Chapters have no Quotations that speak* expresly *of Infant-Baptism: but of Original Sin as it affects Infants: Of the Necessity of Baptism to Salvation: Of Baptism succeeding Circumcision,* &c. *But all the rest are concerning Infant-Baptism expresly, either* for, *or* against *it.*

*I must crave some Pardon for the length of the* 19th *Chapter, which recites the Arguments us'd on both sides in the* Pelagian *Disputes about Original Sin and the Reason of baptizing Infants. My Excuse is, that the Sense of the places would not have been well apprehended, if I had not shewn on what Occasions they were spoken, during the several Steps which that Sect made. There was also a Necessity of reciting the Words both of St.* Austin, *St.* Hierom, *&c. on the one side, and of* Pelagius, Celestius, *&c. on the other, the more at large; because they have been strangely misrepresented in a Treatise that goes for an* History of Pelagianism, *written very partially in favour of that Heresie. It was written in* French: *but has been (together with the Lives of some Fathers written by the same Author, and with the same Sincerity) put into* English *for the use of such among us as incline to* Socinianism.

*The other part contains an Account of some matters proper for the fuller Explication of the Primitive Practice. Of which the chief is, the Enquiry concerning the Baptism and Parentage of those who are brought*

*as*

*as Instances of Persons not baptiz'd in Infancy, tho' born of Christian Parents: for which Work I wish I had been a little better furnished. Yet I think I have rectified some Mistakes concerning some of 'em that had past currently.*

*I have noted in the Margin over-against every Author, the Age wherein he flourished (or began to be a Man of Note, by writing Books,* &c.) viz. *how many Years it was after the Apostles time: (which I make to end with the Year of Christ* 100, *tho' St.* John *liv'd a Year or two beyond it:) and this I do, because during all the Apostles time, every Body is satisfied that the Church had an infallible Direction.*

*I think it needful to give the Reader notice beforehand, that in the Sayings of the Fathers here recited, he will find, that as we, beside the Word* [*to baptize*] *do use the Word* [*to christen*] *in the same Sense; so they us'd several Words to signifie Baptism. The most usual was* ἀναγεννᾶν, *to* regenerate; *which is also a Scripture Word for it. Sometimes they express it* καινοποιεῖν, *or* ἀνακαίνιζειν, *to* renew: *and frequently* ἁγιάζειν, *to* sanctifie. *They frequently by this Word* [the Grace] *do mean Baptism. Sometimes they call it* the Seal, *and frequently* φωτισμὸς, Illumination; *as 'tis also called,* Heb. 6. 4. *and sometimes* τελείωσις, Initiation. *The Sense of the Places will shew that where the Words are of an Infant, or other Person,* regenerated, renewed, sealed, inlightned, initiated, sanctified, *&c. we must understand* baptized.

*I have added a* Dissuasive from Schism, *or Mens renouncing Christian Communion with one another, on account of this difference in Opinion: for which I wish I had a Vein of speaking more powerfully: for I am fully perswaded and clearly of Opinion, that neither this nor most of our other Differences, are any sufficient or reasonable Ground of flying to that dreadful Extremity of Separation.*

*One thing I was resolv'd on: That if I wrote any thing,*

*thing, it ſhould be ſomething which ſhould give no Body any Occaſion to force me to write again. If any one will write againſt this; they ſhall either write againſt the Men that have been dead theſe 1300 Years: or if they find fault with the Notes that I have here and there made on their Words, as not naturally drawn from them; my Anſwer is beforehand, that I will refer it to the Readers, whether they be or no.*

*I conclude with a Story told by* Caſſander (7) *which he makes long, but the Subſtance is this*; " A Man " of Note among the Antipædobaptiſts, being told " that there was a full Agreement of all the An- " cients, who do with one Mouth affirm, that this " Cuſtom of baptizing Infants has been in uſe ever " ſince the Apoſtles times, confeſſed ingenuouſly, " that he did put a great Value upon ſuch a Con- " ſent of the Church, and ſhould be much moved " with ſuch an Agreement of the ancient Chriſtian " Writers: and that if this could be proved by " competent Teſtimonies, he was not ſo obſtinate " as to ſlight ſo forcible a Reaſon: eſpecially if " ſuch Authors were produc'd to prove this, as " lived very nigh the Apoſtles times. And there- " fore he earneſtly deſir'd that the Teſtimonies of " this matter ſhould be ſhewn to him. And ha- " ving read them, and (as he was a Man of good " Senſe) diligently conſider'd 'em; he alter'd " that Opinion which he had taken up from " a miſtaken Underſtanding of the Scripture. Which happened in him becauſe he was endued with theſe three good Qualities.

(7) Præfat. in Teſtimoniade pædobaptiſmo

1. The Fear of God and Reverence for his Word: So that it was by Occaſion of that Zeal for Truth that he fell into this way.
2. Judgment and good Senſe: ſo that he quickly perceived the Force of an Argument.
3. Modeſty and a meek Temper, which cauſed that when he had heard and comprehended the Truth, he did not obſtinately withſtand it.

THE

# THE
# *Contents of the Introduction.*

§. 1. THE Jews baptiz'd all Proſelytes of the Nations that were converted to their Religion. § 2. Their Proof from *Moſes*'s Law that they ought ſo to do. § 3. They baptiz'd alſo the Infant Children whom ſuch Proſelytes brought along with 'em to be enter'd into the Covenant of the true God. § 4. They baptiz'd all ſuch Infant Children of the Heathens as they found, or took in War, *&c.* § 5. The great Light that this gives for the better underſtanding the Meaning of our Saviour's Commiſſion to baptize the Nations, *Mat.* 28. 19. §. 6. The Jews call'd ſuch a Proſelyte's Baptiſm, his *being born again.* Which makes our Saviour's Speech to *Nicodemus, Joh.* 3. 3, 5. more eaſie to be underſtood. § 7. A Parallel inſtituted between the Jewiſh and the Chriſtian Baptiſm. §. 8. The Arguments of Sir *Norton Knatchbul,* Mr. *Stennet,* &c. brought to diſprove this Cuſtom of the Jews, anſwer'd.

# *The Contents of the Book.*

## PART I.

## CHAP. I.

*Quotations out of* Clemens Romanus *and* Hermas. *p.* 1. In the Apoſtle's time.

§ 1. OF Original Sin, as it affects Infants. §. 2. Of the Neceſſity of Baptiſm to Salvation. §3. The Subſtance of that Rule of our Saviour *Joh.* 3. 5. *Except one be born of Water,* &c. expreſſed by *Hermas* before it was written by St. *John.* §. 4. The holy Men of the Old Teſtament repreſented in a Viſion as baptiz'd into the Name of Chriſt by the Apoſtles, after they were dead. The Explication given by the Ancients

cients of those Texts, 1 *Pet.* 3. 19. & 4. 6. *of the Gospel being preached to them that were dead.* §. 5. Of God's tender Regard to Infants. § 6. That these Books of *Clemens* and *Hermas* are genuine. § 7. That they were written before St. *John* wrote his Gospel. § 8. But not so soon after the Death of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* as Bishop *Pearson* and Mr. *Dodwel* place them; proved from *Irenæus.* § 9. That this *Clement* is not probably that *Clement* mention'd *Phil.* 4. 3. nor this *Hermas* he that is named *Rom.* 16. 14.

## CHAP. II.

*Quotations out of* Justin Martyr, *p.* 12.

Year after the Apostles 40.

§ 1. Of Original Sin, needing Redemption and Forgiveness beside the Guilt of Actual Sins. § 2. He speaks of Baptism, as being to us instead of Circumcision. Note on *Col.* 2. 11, 12. § 3. The plain and simple way of Baptism at that time. § 4. They used the Word *Regeneration* to express Baptism; and constantly understand that Text *Joh.* 3. 5. of Water-Baptism. § 5. The modern Writers have alter'd the Sense of the Word *regenerated.* § 6. St. *Justin* speaks of Infants made Disciples.

## CHAP. III.

*Quotations out of* Irenæus. *p.* 17.

Year after the Apostles 67.

§ 1. He speaks of Original Sin as affecting all Mankind; and calls Baptism, *Redemption.* § 2. He expressly reckons Infants among those that are *regenerated.* § 3. He in all other places uses the Word *Regenerating* for baptizing. § 4. Several Instances shewing that the Ancients do use this Word for Baptism, so as to exclude that Conversion or Repentance that is not accompanied with Baptism, from being signified by it. § 5. When Infants are said to be *regenerated*, there can in their case be nothing else understood, but *baptized.* § 6. Of the time when *Irenæus* wrote, and the Country where he was educated: and how impossible it is to conceive that the Christians then should be ignorant, whether in the Apostle's time Children were baptiz'd or not. §. 7. A Testimony of any Father is not to be so much regarded, as it speaks his Opinion; as it is for that it gives an Evidence of the Practice or Belief of the Church at that time.

Year after the Apostles 100.

## CHAP. IV.

*Quotations out of* Tertullian. *p.* 22.

§. 1. A Premonition concerning *Tertullian* and *Origen* that they were guilty of great Errors: yet may serve for evidence of the Practice of the Church at that time. *Origen*'s strange Opinion of Original Sin, that it is deriv'd from Sins which the Soul has committed before it was united to the Body. § 2. *Tertullian* reckons the Time or Age of one's receiving *Baptism* among those Questions that are not essential to it. § 3. He takes it for a *Prescription* or standing Rule, *That none can be saved without Baptism*; and Answers the Objection of the Apostles not being baptiz'd; refuting those that say, *Faith is sufficient for Salvation without Baptism.* § 4. He allows Laymen to baptize in case of the danger of Death; and says, If they refuse to do it, they are *guilty of the Party's Perdition.* § 5. Speaking of the weightiness of Baptism, he advises the delay of it in the case of several sorts of Persons; as of Infants till they are of Age to understand: of unmarried Persons and young Widows, till the danger of Lust be over. And in Contradiction to what he had said before, says, *That an entire Faith is secure of Salvation.* And of Infants says, *What need has their innocent Age to make such haste for the forgiveness of Sins?* § 6. He in another Book speaks of Infants as being *unclean* and *sinful*; and that they are not holy, nor can enter into the Kingdom of God till they are baptiz'd: contrary to what he said before. § 7. An Attempt to reconcile these Differences in his Sayings. He seems to have thought, that in case of danger of Death, Infants, Virgins, Widows, *&c.* must be baptiz'd presently; otherwise they might better be delay'd. § 8. This is agreed to have been his Opinion by several both of the Pædobaptists and Antipædobaptists. The unfair dealing of *Rigaltius*, to leave out of the last Edition (without giving any reason, from the MSS.) those words of *Tertullian* that were in the former Edition, which do plainly express this meaning. § 9. It appears by his words, that Baptism of Infants and Godfathers for them, were then in use. § 10. His absurd Comment on *Mat.* 19. 14. *Suffer little Children*, &c. § 11. He says the Heathens had a Rite of baptizing, and call'd it *Regeneration.*

§ 12. He takes the *Holineſs* mention'd 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. for baptiſmal Holineſs *deſigned* to them. § 13. His Book of Baptiſm had not come into the hands of moſt of the learned Men of the next Centuries: or elſe they would not quote him, as being an Heretic. Yet S. *Hierom* had ſeen it.

## CHAP. V.

Year after the Apoſtles 110.

*Quotations out of* Origen, *p.* 33.

§ 1. That Infants were then baptiz'd *by the uſage of the Church.* § 2. His Enquiry for what Sins they were baptiz'd. § 3. His Teſtimony that the *Apoſtles ordered* Infants to be baptiz'd. § 4. Some Paſſages of his that are to this purpoſe, but are ſpurious or doubtful, rejected. § 5. His Homilies on S. *Luke* were certainly tranſlated by S. *Hierom.* § 6. What credit is to be given to the others that were done by *Rufinus.* § 7. An Objection of Mr. *Tomb*'s againſt their being authentic, conſider'd. And in what ſenſe *Origen* laid any Foundation for *Pelagianiſm.* § 8. That *Rufinus* would never have inſerted any thing making for the Doctrine of Original Sin, that his private Opinion was againſt it. § 9. He enquires whether the Guardian Angel given to Infants, and ſpoken of *Mat.* 18. 10. be given at their Birth or at their Baptiſm. § 10. The Advantages that *Origen* had to know the practice of Chriſtians from the beginning.

## CHAP. VI.

Year after the Apoſtles

*Quotations out of* S. Cyprian, *p.* 44.

§ 1. The Letter written by him and 66 Biſhops in Council with him, in anſwer to *Fidus*, who had ask'd their Opinion, whether an Infant might be baptiz'd before he were eight days old. § 2. There is not in all Antiquity any piece more clearly prov'd to be genuine than this Letter. § 3. The Ignorance of thoſe that enquire, why this Council is not in the Volumes of Councils. § 4. A Reflection on that Obſervation of *Grotius*, that there is in the Councils no earlier mention of Infant Baptiſm, than in the Council of *Carthage*, *Ann.* 418. § 5. S. *Auſtin*, who had ſaid that Infant Baptiſm was not inſtituted in any Council, but was ever in uſe, does not contradict himſelf in citing this Council, which does not in-

institute it, but takes it for granted. § 6. The reason why the Argument used by these Fathers to satisfie *Fidus*, seem to some Men frivolous. § 7. The force of the Argument for Infant Baptism from such a Debate, manag'd by so many ancient Men, and so nigh the time of the Apostles; of whom not one made any doubt but Infants were to be baptiz'd. § 8. Of the *Kiss of Peace*, then usually given to the new-baptiz'd Person. § 9. They then held, That to suffer an Infant to die unbaptiz'd, was to endanger its Salvation. § 10. A Mistake of Mr. *Daillé* in the reading of this Letter. § 11. Another Passage of S. *Cyprian*, speaking of Infants as baptiz'd. § 12. S. *Austin*'s Note on it. § 13. Another of the absolute necessity of Baptism to Salvation. § 14. Note on that Text *Joh.* 3: 5. and the Argument drawn by some Antipœdobaptists from it.

## CHAP. VII.

Year after the Apostles 205.

*A Quotation out of the Council of* Eliberis, *p.* 59.

§ 1. They speak of some Infants carried over from the Catholick Church to the Sectaries. § 2. The severe Penance they inflict on such as have, after years of discretion, revolted to the Schismatics, and would return to the Church.

## CHAP. VIII.

Year after the Apostles 214.

*Out of the Council of* Neocæsarea; *p.* 61.

§ 1. Can. 6. *That a Woman with Child may be baptiz'd when she please*, &c. § 2. The Antipœdobaptists explication of the reason of this Canon. § 3. The Pædobaptists explication of it. § 4. That the words are capable of either of the senses: but the notation of the word ἐὰν enclines more to the latter. § 5. The Emphasis of that word, useful likewise to shew the force of that Text 1 *Cor.* 7. 1, 2. against Polygamists. § 6. *Grotius* cites *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, as if they had represented the Council as determining against Infant Baptism. § 7. The Words of those two Commentators produced at large to the contrary. § 8. The Words of this Council prove nothing for or against Infant Baptism.

## CHAP. IX.

Year after the Apostles 260.

*Out of* Optatus *Bishop of* Milevis, *p.* 68.

§ 1. The *Donatists* had no difference with the *Catholics* about the manner or subject of Baptism. § 2. *Optatus* speaks of Baptism as fit for Infants.

## CHAP. X.

Year after the Apostles 260.

*Out of* Gregory Nazianzen, *concerning St.* Basil's *being baptiz'd in Infancy, p.* 69.

§ 1. *Gregory* describes Baptism by a peculiar sort of Periphrasis [*the diurnal formation*, &c.] § 2. He speaks of the same as applied to S. *Basil* in Infancy.

## CHAP. XI.

Year after the Apostles 260.

*Other Quotations out of S.* Gregory, *concerning the Doctrine of Infant Baptism, p.* 73.

§. 1. He had the most reason to be prejudiced against the Doctrine of the necessity of Infant Baptism. § 2. An Abstract of his Sermon concerning Baptism; the several Names of Baptism: It is a Seal for those that enter into this Life, &c. There is no other Regeneration but that. § 3. Against the delay of Baptism. § 4. His Exhortation to Parents to baptize their Infants without delay. § 5. His Answer to the Pretences of those that put off Baptism. § 6. Infants dying unbaptiz'd, and others that miss of Baptism not by their own fault, will not be punish'd: but yet neither will they be glorified. § 7. Infants that are in any danger of dying must be baptiz'd presently: Others, he advises, should be baptiz'd about three years old. § 8. He declares he will baptize no adult Person that is an *Arian*, or does not believe the Trinity. § 9. Some Observations from the whole; 1. A plain Specimen of *Grotius*'s foul dealing in perverting the Sense of *Nazianzen*'s Words concerning the loss suffer'd by Infants dying unbaptiz'd, to a quite contrary purpose; as if his meaning were, That Infants did not use to be baptiz'd. § 10. 2. An Abstract of what *Nazianzen* appears to have held about the Fate of those Infants that did obtain Baptism, and of those that missed of it. § 11. 3. His and other Authors frequent use of the word

*san-*

*sanctified* or *holy* for *baptized.* The Paraphrase of S. *Paul's* Discourse 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. given according to their sense: Several Observations from Scripture and Antiquity that do confirm that sense. The inconvenience of some other Explications. § 12. An Enquiry on occasion of St. *Gregory's* refusing to baptize *Arians*, and the *Catholics* then refusing Communion with them: how far the Catholics now can admit the Project of the *Socinians*, call'd, *The Agreement between the* Unitarians *and the* Catholic *Church.* § 13. They explain the Divinity of Christ only by God's *inhabiting* in him. § 14. They have alter'd their Notion of the Λόγος from one Extreme to the other, and yet keep their main Article still, of Christ's having no Nature but the Humane. § 15. The ill colours they put on the Catholic Faith. § 16. The Progress they boast they should make, if they had a Toleration, has no president in former Ages. § 17. Difference in lesser Opinions, is no bar against Communion: But it is otherwise in Fundamentals. § 18. The mean Opinion they have of Christ's Satisfaction. § 19. The distinct Assemblies, which they say they will hold for preserving the Doctrine of the Unity of the God-head are needless. § 20. Their virulent endeavour to blacken the *Nicene Creed.*

## CHAP. XII.

Year after Apostl. 260.

*Out of S. Basil, p.* 100.

§ 1. An Abstract of his Sermon perswading People to Baptism. § 2. Any time of one's Life proper for Baptism. § 3. He speaks to several of his Auditory, as having been instructed in Christian Religion from Infancy, and not yet baptized. § 4. Many at that time were perswaded of the Truth of Christian Religion, and intended to be baptized into it some time or other, but put it off. These Mens Children were instructed in it, but not yet baptized; because the Parents themselves were not yet baptized. § 5. He proves the necessity of Baptism from the Threat denounced against an Infant that was not circumcised on the eighth day. § 6. His pathetical Discourse against the delay of Repentance and Baptism. § 7. He tells some People that had wrote to him of Baptism, that they must first be instructed, and

then admitted to Baptism. § 8. His explication of *John* 3. 3, 5. § 9. He speaks of Boys and little Children joyning in the Divine Offices. § 10. He advises *Valens* to have his Child baptized by the *Catholics*; but *Valens* would have it done by the *Arians*. § 11. A Disquisition concerning the Age of that Child.

## CHAP. XIII.

Year after Apostl. 274.

*Out of St.* Ambrose, *p.* 108.

§. 1. He speaks of Infant Baptism being in use in his and *in the Apostles time.* § 2. He makes it a Question, whether an Infant can be sav'd without Baptism.

## CHAP. XIV.

Year after Apostl. 280.

*Out of St.* Chrysostom, *p.* 111.

§ 1. He says, One in Infancy, or one in Middle-age, or one in Old-age, may receive Baptism. § 2. He often affirms, That there is no entring the Kingdom of Heaven without Baptism. § 3. He says, Infants are baptized, tho' they have no Sins. § 4. S. *Austin's* Defence of him against the *Pelagians*, who challeng'd him for one of their side. § 5. His mention of the Sign of the Cross made on the Infant's Forehead at its Baptism.

## CHAP. XV.

Year after Apostl. 280.

*Out of S.* Hierom *and S.* Austin, *before the rise of the* Pelagian *Controversie.*

*Sect.* 1. *p.* 116.

Out of S. *Hierom's* Letter to *Leta.*

S. *Hierom* says, If Infants be not baptiz'd, the Sin of omitting it is laid to the Parents charge.

*Sect.* 2. *p.* 118.

Out of S. *Austin's* Book *de Sermone Domini in monte.*

S. *Austin* explains those words, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Now are your Children holy*, thus, *Now are your Children baptiz'd.*

*Sect.* 3. *p.* 121.

Out of S. *Austin's* Books *de libero Arbitrio.*

§ 1. He makes answer to those that ask'd, What good Baptism does to Children before they have any Faith? § 2. A reflection on that Saying of *Grotius*, That S. *Austin* before he was heated by the *Pelagian* Controversie, never wrote any thing of the Condemnation of unbaptiz'd Infants.

*Sect.*

*Sect.* 4. *p.* 124.

Out of S. *Austin's* Books *de Baptismo, contra Donatistas.*

§. 1. S. *Austin's* way of managing against the *Donatists.* § 2. He proves, that Infants or others baptiz'd in the right Form, tho' in a Schismatical or Heretical Church, have their Baptism valid. § 3. He speaks of Infant Baptism as a thing practis'd by the whole Church, and not instituted by any Council, but having ever been in use, and order'd by the Apostles; and that it is to us instead of Circumcision. And tho' God has commanded both Faith and Baptism, yet either of 'em, where the other cannot be had, is available to Salvation. § 4. The mistake of those who say, The *Donatists* denied Infant Baptism

*Sect.* 5. *p.* 134.

Out of S. *Austin's* Letter to *Boniface.*

§ 1. He answers the Question, How the Faith of Parents stands their Children in stead for their Baptism, and yet the Apostasie of the Parent afterward does not hurt the Child. § 2. That the validity of the Baptism does not depend on the right Faith or Intention of those that bring the Child: The Child is suppos'd to be offer'd to Baptism by the whole Congregation that pray for it. § 3. That the Parents at that time were usually the Godfathers; but that this Office might be done by any other that was Owner of the Child. § 4. In what sense the Answer made by the Godfathers in the name of the Child, *that he does renounce, believe,* &c. is to be understood. § 5. S. *Austin* speaks of these Questions and Answers as necessary. § 6. He supposes it to be the Belief of all Christians, That Children baptiz'd and dying before actual Sin, are undoubtedly saved. § 7. He had no notion of Transubstantiation. § 8. The custom then to receive the Holy Communion every Day, or at least every Lord's-Day. § 9. He does not pretend that Infants have Faith: The Opinion of the *Lutherans,* and the Fancy of *F. Malebranche* on that Subject.

*Sect.* 6. *p.* 149.

Out of the Books *de Genesi ad literam.*

§ 1. A Debate concerning the Origin of the Soul; whether it be by Propagation or immediate Creation. S. *Austin* shews that the former agrees best with the Doctrine of Original Sin. § 2. The true reading of a place in S. *Austin de Genesi ad lit. l.* 10. *c.* 23. of *Infant Baptism*

*being order'd by the Apostles*, restor'd by Bishop *Stillingfleet* out of the MSS.

*Sect.* 7. *p.* 155.

Out of S. *Austin's* Letter to S. *Hierom.*

§ 1. S. *Austin* desires S. *Hierom*'s Opinion, how Original Sin can be explain'd if the Infant's Soul be anew created. § 2. The Opinion of some Moderns of the nature of the Soul; and of the Antipædobaptists concerning the sleep of the Soul. § 3. Private Baptism of Children in Homes not used in S. *Austin's* time, except in cases of the utmost extremity. How much the *English Presbyterians* have chang'd their Sentiments about that matter.

CHAP. XVI.

Year after the Apostles 297.

*Quotations out of some Councils of* Carthage *before the* Pelagian *Controversie, p.* 165.

§ 1. The Bishops make a Question whether they shall admit to holy Orders those who had been in their Infancy baptized by the *Donatists*, and were since come over to the *Catholic* Church. They ask the Opinion of neighbouring Bishops. § 2. They determine afterwards that such may be admitted. § 3. A Canon for abating to poor People the Fees due for baptizing their Children; but thought to be spurious. § 4. A Canon made for the case of such as had been in their Infancy carried captive into the Country of *Barbarians*, and when return'd, could not tell whether they had been baptiz'd before their Captivity or not; ordering that such should be baptiz'd. § 5. A Canon of a former Council of *Hippo* to the same purpose. § 6. A Decree afterwards of Pope *Leo* to the same purpose.

CHAP. XVII.

Year after the Apostles 284.

*Out of the Decretal Epistles of* Siricius *and* Innocentius, *Bishops of* Rome, *p.* 175.

§ 1. The gross way of forging Decretal Epistles for the Bishops of *Rome* of the first Ages. § 2. *Sirtius*'s Epistles are the first that are genuine; all before him are forg'd. § 3. He declares the Order and Practice of the Churches to be, That none be baptiz'd but at the set and appointed times of the Year for Baptism, *viz. Easter* and *Whitsuntide*; except Infants, sick Persons, or others that may be in danger of Death before that time. § 4. Proof that

that this Epistle is not forg'd, as the foregoing are. § 5. The reason of that Order, That no adult Person, except in case of necessity, should be baptiz'd but at the times aforesaid: And of the custom of catechising in *Lent*. § 6. He informs the Christians of *Spain*, That Bishops and Presbyters ought to be chosen, not out of new Converts, but of such as have been baptiz'd in Infancy. §. 7. *Innocentius* informs *Decentius*, that tho' Presbyters may baptize Infants, only Bishops may give them *Chrism* or *Confirmation*. § 8. He repeats to the Council of *Toledo* the Advice of *Siricius*, that the Clergy ought to be chosen, not out of Novices, but of such as have been baptiz'd in Infancy.

## CHAP. XVIII.

Year after the Apostles 293.

*Out of* Paulinus *Bishop of* Nola: *and another* Paulinus, *Deacon of the Church of* Milan, *p.* 186.

§ 1. An Inscription compos'd to be set over the Font, mentioning Infants there baptiz'd. § 2. That all new-baptiz'd persons, young or old, were about this time called *Infants*. § 3. An Epitaph made on a Child seven years old, mentioning his Baptism. § 4. *Paulinus* desires *S. Hierom*'s Opinion how *S. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. calls the Children of Christians *holy*, when as without Baptism they cannot be saved. § 5. *S. Hierom's* Answer; agreeing, That without Baptism they can't be saved. § 6. *Paulinus* the Deacon, in relating *S. Ambrose*'s Death, mentions some Infants then newly baptiz'd.

## CHAP. XIX.

Year after the Apostles 310.

*Out of* S. Hierom *and S.* Austin, *after the rise of the* Pelagian *Controversie: as also out of* Pelagius, Celestius, Innocent *the first*, Zosimus, Julianus, Theodorus Mopsuestensis, *&c. and out of the Councils of* Diospolis, Milevis, Carthage, *&c. p.* 194.

§ 1. The Occasion the *Pelagian* Controversie gave to speak of Infant Baptism. § 2. The account of this Controversie given by Mr. *le Clerc*, is very partial for *Pelagius*. § 3. *Pelagius* was a *Briton*, not a *Scot*; and *Celestius* an *Irishman*. § 4. They vented their Opinion against the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, at first covertly, and by

by way of Objection. § 5. *Celestius* being examin'd at the Council of *Carthage*, *anno* 412. would not own Original Sin; yet granted the necessity of Infant Baptism. § 6. S. *Austin* proves against the *Pelagians*, That Infants have Sin, because it was acknowledg'd that they must be baptiz'd. § 7. He refutes that Evasion of theirs, That they are baptiz'd not for forgiveness of Sins, but to gain them admission into the Kingdom of Heaven. § 8. And another Evasion, That they are baptiz'd for Sins committed by their Souls in a state of Praexistence. § 9. He proves that Christ came to save only such as were in a lost condition; and that only such are to be baptiz'd. § 10. That there is no middle state between Salvation and some degree of Damnation. § 11. Refutes those that said, Infants have actual Sins, as Peevishness, *&c.* and that they are baptiz'd for them. All the *Pelagians* own'd that Infants are to be baptiz'd. § 12. *Celestius* own'd, that Infants have *Redemption* by their Baptism, but would not say *Forgiveness*. § 13. The Dispute between the Catholics and *Pelagians* about the Necessity of God's Grace. § 14. The unfair account of this Dispute given by Mr. *le Clerc*. § 15. How far *Pelagius* owned God's Grace. § 16. How far he recanted what he had said against it. § 17. S. *Austin* asserts, That the whole Church has from of old constantly held, and that he never read or heard of any Christian Catholic or Sectary who denied, that Infants are baptiz'd for Forgiveness. § 18. How Parents that are by Baptism cleansed from Original Sin, do yet beget Children liable to it. § 19. Several Interpretations given by the Antients of that Text, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Now are your Children holy*, conferr'd together. § 20. S. *Hierom's* Letter to *Ctesiphon*. Some blasphemous Tenets of the *Pelagians*. S. *Austin's* Letter to *Hilarius* and management of the Argument for Original Sin, from *Rom.* 5. § 21. Dispute between S. *Austin* and the *Pelagians*, of the possibility of a rich man's being saved, and of the lawfulness of Swearing in any case. § 22. The Sophistical way of arguing used by the *Pelagians*. § 23. *Pelagius* was the first that ever affirmed the blessed Virgin *Mary* to be sinless. § 24. What *Pelagius* own'd, and what he denied, and how he came off in the Meeting at *Jerusalem*, and in the Synod of *Diospolis*. He was forced there to anathematize all those that say *unbaptized Infants may have eternal Life*. § 25. The *Greek* Fathers condemn *Pelagianism* as well as the

*Latin.*

*Latin.* A Reflection on some Sayings of *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret.* § 26. S. *Hierom* shews that *Pelagius* must either own that the Baptism of Infants is for Forgiveness of Sins, or else he must make two sorts of Baptism, one for Infants, and another for grown Persons: Whereas the *Constantinopolitan* Creed had determin'd that there is but *one Baptism*, and that *for the Forgiveness of Sins.* § 27. *Pelagius* openly denies Original Sin, and explains what he had said at *Diospolis* in an equivocal sense. § 28. Synodical Epistles from the Councils of *Carthage* and *Melevis, anno* 416. to Pope *Innocent* against *Pelagius.* And *Innocent's* Answer. § 29. *Pelagius*'s Creed, which he sent to *Innocent* for his own Vindication, recited at large; wherein he owns, that *Baptism is to be administred to Infants with the same Words as it is to elder Persons.* § 30. His Letter sent at the same time wherein he declares *he never heard any one* Catholic *or Sectary deny Infants Baptism.* § 31. *Celestius*'s Creed, owning, that *Infants are to be baptized for Forgiveness of Sins, according to the Rule of the Universal Church*; and yet maintaining, *that they have no Sin deriv'd from* Adam. § 32. *Pelagius* also was at last brought to this contradiction, That the Baptism of Infants is for Forgiveness of Sins; and yet they have no Sin. How he endeavour'd to make sense of this, and then gave over disputing. § 33. Pope *Zosimus* first declares for *Celestius*, and sitting in judicature, pronounces his Creed (wherein he denied Original Sin) to be Catholic; and afterwards condemns both him and his Doctrine, and confesses all Persons to be under the Bond of Original Sin till they be baptiz'd. His Letters *pro & contra* on this Subject. § 34. S. *Austin*'s charitable endeavour to salve the Credit of *Zosimus.* § 35. *Celestius* pleads, that so long as one gives Baptism to Infants, the Question whether they have Original Sin, or not, is not a fundamental one; and a Mistake in that is no Heresie. S. *Austin* holds the contrary. § 36. How great Opportunities *Pelagius* and *Celestius* had, to know whether there were any Christians in the World that denied Infants Baptism; and how much it had been their Interest to mention 'em if there had been any such. § 37. The second Canon of the Council of *Carthage, anno* 418, condemning the *Pelagians* who said, Infants were to be baptiz'd for Forgiveness of Sin, and yet that they had no Original Sin. § 38. *Julian* continues the Dispute with S. *Austin* after *Pelagius* was condemn'd. He pretending that the Catholics

lies had gone about to make the People believe that he denied Baptism to Infants, anathematizes any that deny it. § 39. A new Device of *Theodorus* Bishop of *Mopsuestia*, to reconcile these two things; That Infants are to be baptiz'd for Forgiveness of Sin, and yet that they have none. § 40. The Tenets of the *Semipelagians* concerning God's Decree about Infants obtaining Baptism, *viz.* which shall partake of it, and which not.

Year after the Apostles 318.

## CHAP. XX.

*Out of S.* Austin *and* Vincentius Victor, *p.* 283.

§ 1. The time when *Vincentius* publish'd his new *Hypothesis.* § 2. The substance of it, *viz.* That unbaptiz'd Infants should be admitted to Paradise, tho' not to Heaven: with S. *Austin*'s Answer. § 3. He adds something more to it, *viz.* That they may possibly go to Heaven, but not till the Resurrection. S. *Austin*'s Answer. The practice of those times in praying for the Dead. § 4. The mistake of a late Writer in thinking that *Vincentius* denied Infants Baptism. § 5. *Vincentius* recants what he had written. § 6. A Clause that in some Copies is added to the second Canon of the Council of *Carthage, anno* 418; and a conjecture at the reason why some Copies have this Clause, and others not.

From the Year after the Apostles 67, to 350.

## CHAP. XXI.

Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, S. Austin, *and* Theodoret, *who wrote each of 'em Catalogues of all the Sects of Christians that they had heard of, do none of 'em mention any that denied Infants Baptism, p.* 293.

§ 1. The *Donatists, Arians, Pelagians*, and all other Sects that S. *Austin* or *Pelagius* had heard or read of, if they were such as used any Baptism at all, did use to give it to Infants. § 2. The Sects recited by *Irenæus*; their monstrous Tenets about the Deity: The reason of inserting that Clause into the Creed, *THE Maker of Heaven and Earth.* What they held singular about Baptism. § 3. Of some Sects that baptiz'd People after they were dead, and others that baptiz'd a living Person in the name of another that was dead: The various Interpretations given by the Ancients and Moderns of that Saying of S. *Paul, Why are they then baptiz'd for the dead?*

§ 4. No

§. 4. No Sect is said to have had any difference with the Church about the baptizing of Infants; but the *Pelagians* differ'd in their Opinion about the effects of it in Infants. § 5. Of the *Hieracites*, who held that no Infant can go to Heaven. They thought it unlawful to marry or get Children.

## CHAP. XXII.

*Containing References to the Books of some Authors of the next succeeding Age.* p. 306.

From the Year after the Apostles 300, to 400.

They do all speak of Infant Baptism as a thing taken for granted. A Story that will shame our Merchants that take no care of instructing and baptizing their *Negroes*.

## CHAP. XXIII.

*Quotations out of some Books that are spurious, i. e. not written by those whose Names they bear, but yet are prov'd to be ancient.* p. 311.

Year after the Apostles 300.

§ 1. Out of *Clement's Constitutions*, ordering Christians to baptize their Infants; with some account of that Book. § 2. Out of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*; Answering the Objections of the Heathens, who derided the Christians for baptizing Infants, and for their use of Godfathers. § 3. Out of the *Questions ad Orthodoxos* ascrib'd to *Justin Martyr*, and the *Questions ad Antiochum* ascrib'd to *Athanasius*, concerning the future state of Infants of the Heathens, and of the Infants of Christians dying unbaptiz'd.

THE

# *The Introduction.*

§. 1. THE meaning and full import of a Rule given in any old Book for the doing of any thing is not ſo well apprehended by us, unleſs we underſtand the Hiſtory of that Nation and of that time in which the ſaid Rule was given. And this holds eſpecially for ſuch Rules as are expreſs'd in very ſhort and general Words.

For 'tis common for a Rule or Law to be ſo worded, as that one may perceive that the Lawgier has ſuppoſed or taken for granted, that the People to whom it was given did already know and underſtand ſome things which were previous to the apprehending of his meaning: ſo that 'twas needleſs to expreſs 'em. But tho' theſe things were ordinarily known to the People of that Time and Place; yet we that live at ſo great a diſtance of time do not know 'em without an inquiry made into the Hiſtory of the State of that time, as to thoſe things which the Law ſpeaks of: and conſequently without ſuch inquiry the Law or Rule that was plain to them, will in many particulars be obſcure to us. So, for Example, many of the *Grecian* and *Roman* Laws, whereof we have Copies yet extant, would not be well underſtood by us, unleſs they were explain'd to us by ſuch as have skill in the Hiſtory of the ſtate of Affairs in thoſe Empires. And ſo, many paſſages in the Books of the new Teſtament of our Saviour Chriſt are not rightly apprehended without having recourſe to the Books of the old Teſtament, and other Books wherein the Cuſtoms of the *Jewiſh* Nation are ſet forth, for underſtanding the ſtate of Religion among that People at that time when our Saviour gave his Rules.

And another thing that does much help us in underſtanding the meaning of any ſuch old Law, that is given in ſuch ſhort Words, is, to obſerve and learn how the Men that liv'd in, or ſo near that Time, that the meaning of the Law-giver muſt eaſily be known by 'em,

did

did practise it. For in what particulars soever we may doubt how or in what manner it is to be executed, their Actions and Declarations do serve as Precedents to us upon the said Law. And this holds especially in such Laws as have been in continual use from the time of their enacting to this time.

Now our Saviour's Law concerning *Baptizing all the Nations*, is, as I shewed in the Preface, set down in Scripture in very short and general Words: And many People of later times have doubted whether it is to be understood to reach to the baptizing of Infants, or only of adult Persons. All that have any such doubt, ought to have recourse to the two several helps for understanding the said Law, which I have here propos'd.

I mean, they ought to learn as well as they can; what was the State of the *Jewish* Religion as to Baptism, at and before that time when our Saviour gave his Order for baptizing all the Nations; and what we must suppose the Apostles did of themselves already know concerning its being proper or improper for Infants, which it might not be so needful for our Saviour to express in his new Direction to 'em.

And also they ought to learn as well as they can, how the first Christians did practise in this matter: whether they baptiz'd their Infants or not.

'Tis the later of these two things, that I have taken upon me as my task to shew; *viz.* how the Primitive Christians did practise: and this I do by giving you their own Words, without omitting any that I know of for the first 400 years after Christ.

But yet some knowledge of the other point also (*viz.* how the Jews in and before our Saviour's time did use to act in reference to the baptizing of Infants) is so very necessary to a right understanding of the Words both of our Saviour and his Apostles, and also of the Primitive Christians; and he that knows nothing of it, is so incompetent a judge of the force of their Sayings; that I think it needful for the use of ordinary Readers to premise, by way of Introduction, some account of that matter also.

But I do not pretend in this Introduction in which I treat of the custom of the Jews in baptizing Infants before our Saviour's time, to do as I do in the Book it self, wherein I treat of the custom of the Christians in baptizing them after it: That is, to recite all the Authorities

thorities that are about that matter. Partly because the Quotations for that purpose are to be search'd for in Books with which I am not so well acquainted: And partly because those few which I shall produce, will make it clear enough that there was such a custom. I shall therefore content my self with reciting such of 'em as have been already made use of by Learned Men: Such as *Ainsworth* on *Gen.* 17. Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations on *Mat.* 3. *Mat.* 19. *Mat.* 23. *John* 3. *it. Six Queries. it. Defence of Infant Baptism. Selden de jure Nat. & Gent. juxta Hebræos. it. de Synedriis. it. de successionibus*, &c. Dr. *Lightfoot. Hor. Hebr.* on *Mat.* 3. and *John* 3. *it. Harmony on new Testament. Luke* 3. *Jacob. Alting. prælectio* 7. *de proselytis*, &c. and the Learned Author of the *Discourse concerning Lent. Pt.* 2. *Ch.* 2.

First then, it is Evident that the custom of the Jews before our Saviour's time (and, as they themselves affirm, from the beginning of their Law) was to baptize as well as Circumcise any Proselyte that came over to them from the Nations. This does fully appear both from the Books of the Jews themselves, and also of others that understood the Jewish customs and have Written of 'em. They reckon'd all Mankind beside themselves to be in an unclean State, and not capable of being enter'd into the Covenant of *Israelites* without a *Washing* or *Baptism*, to denote their Purification from their Uncleanness. And this was called the Baptizing of 'em unto *Moses.*

This custom of theirs is fully and largely set forth by *Maimonides. Isuri Bia.* c. 13. & 14.

He had been saying there that the *Israelites* themselves were enter'd into Covenant by Circumcision, Baptism, and Sacrifice. And then he adds;

*And so in all Ages when an* Ethnic *is willing to enter into the Covenant and gather himself under the Wings of the Majesty of God, and take upon him the Yoke of the Law; he must be Circumcis'd, and Baptiz'd, and bring a Sacrifice; or if it be a Woman, be baptiz'd, and bring a Sacrifice. As it is Written* (a); As you are, so shall the Stranger be. *How are you? By Circumcision, and Baptism, and bringing of a Sacrifice. So likewise the Stranger* [or Proselyte] *thro' all Generations; by Circumcision and Baptism and bringing of a Sacrifice. And what is the Strangers Sacrifice? A*

b *Burnt-*

(a) Numb. 15. 15.

*Burnt-offering of a Beast, or two Turtle Doves, or two young Pigeons, both of 'em for a Burnt-offering.*

*And at this time, when there is no Sacrificing; they must be circumcis'd and baptiz'd: and when the Temple shall be built, they are to bring the Sacrifice.*

*A Stranger that is circumcis'd and not baptiz'd; or baptiz'd and not circumcis'd; he is not a Proselyte till he be both circumcis'd and baptiz'd. And he must be baptiz'd in the presence of three,* &c.

*Even as they circumcise and baptize Strangers; so do they circumcise and baptize Servants that are received from Heathens, into the name of Servitude,* &c.

*When a Man or a Woman comes to join as a Proselyte; they make diligent inquiry concerning such, lest they come to get themselves under the Law for some Riches that they should receive, or for Dignity that they should obtain; or for fear. If it be a Man; they inquire whether he have not set his Affection on some* Jewish *Woman: or a Woman, her Affection on some young Man of* Israel. *If no such like occasion be found in them, they make known unto 'em the weightiness of the yoke of the Law, and the toil that is in the doing thereof, above that which People of other Lands have: To see if they will go back. If they take it upon them, and withdraw not; and they see that they come of Love; then they receive 'em,* &c.

*Therefore the Judges received no Proselyte all the days of* David *and* Solomon. *Not in* David's *days, lest they should have come of fear: Nor in* Solomon's, *lest they should have come because of the Kingdom and great Prosperity which* Israel *then had. For whoso comes from the* Heathens *for any thing of the Vanities of this World, he is no righteous Proselyte. Notwithstanding there were many Proselytes that in* David's *and* Solomon's *time joined themselves in the presence of private Persons: and the Judges of the great* Synedrion *had a care of 'em. They drove 'em not away, after they were baptiz'd, out of any place: Neither took they 'em near to them, until their after-fruits appeared.*

*Maimonides* gives at the same place an account of several Circumstances of Time, Place, &c. observed in this action of baptizing a Proselyte. As that, *They baptized not a Proselyte on the Sabbath, nor on a holy day, nor by night,* &c. *They do it in a confluence of Waters,* &c. *Assoon as he grows whole of the wound of Circumcision, they bring him to Baptism: And being placed in the Water, they again instruct him,* &c. And such a confluence of Waters, *Jonathan's*

*Chaldee*

*Chaldee* Paraphrase determines ought not to be less than 40 of the measures called *Sata*, where he Paraphrases on *Exod.* 29. *Lev.* 11. and other Places.

The *Talmud* says the same thing of receiving Proselytes by Baptism: only whereas *Maimonides* speaks of the number of three, as necessary to be present at the baptizing; the *Talmud Babylonic* does not insist on any more than two grave Men.

*Talmud. Babylon. Mass. Jevamoth, fol.* 47.

*When a Proselyte is received, he must be Circumcised: And then when he is cured* [of the wound of Circumcision] *they Baptize him in the presence of two wise Men, saying*; Behold he is an *Israelite* in all things. *Or if it be a Woman; the Women lead her to the Waters*, &c.

But the *Talmud Hierosol. Jevamoth* says as *Maimonides* does, that *a Proselyte has need of three* (b). And directs the other Circumstances as he does, *viz. They do not baptize a Proselyte by night* (c). And, *They were not baptized till the pain of Circumcision were healed* (d).

And the same continues to this day to be the practice of the present Jews. For so *Leo Modena* in his History of them. *Pt.* 5. *CH.* 2. speaking of a Proselyte's admission; *They take and Circumcise him: and as soon as he is well of his sore, he is to wash himself all over in Water: and this is to be done in the presence of three* Rabbins, &c. *And so from thenceforth he becomes as a natural* Jew.

The Books do speak of this Washing, or Baptism, as absolutely necessary; and an Ordinance without which none was to be counted a Proselyte. So

*Gemara Babylon. ad tit. Cheritboth. c.* 2.

*The Proselytes enter'd not into Covenant, but by Circumcision, Baptism, and sprinkling of Blood.*

And *Tit. Jabimoth. c.* 4.

*He is no Proselyte unless he be Circumcised and Baptized.* And, *If he be not Baptized; he remains a Gentile* [or Pagan]. And there is in that Chapter a proof given of that Opinion of the necessity, which I shall have occasion by and by to mention.

*Maimonides* says the same thing, as we saw in the Chapter I quoted before (e).



(b) Fol. 46. 2. (c) Fol. 46. 2. (d) Fol. 41. 2. (e) Isuri Bia. c. 13.

Also the *Talmud Tract. Repudii.* speaking of *Jethro*, *Moses*'s Father-in-Law.

*He was made a Proselyte by Circumcision and Immersion in Waters.*

This custom of the Jews continued after Christ's time, and after their expulsion from the Holy Land; and continues (as I shew'd from *Leo Modena*) to this day, if there be any that now a-days do turn Proselytes to their Religion. Wherever they sojourned; if they found any of that Country that chose to be of their Religion, they would not admit him, unless he would first be washed or baptized by them. And some Heathen Writers do express a great deal of Scorn and Disdain at this their valuing themselves upon their own Purity in comparison with other Nations. So *Arrianus*, a Philosopher at *Rome* (about the year of Christ 147) jeers (f) those that turn'd Proselytes to the Jews, calling them βεβαμμένους, *dipt*: and describes their custom to be, that when a Man is so dipt by them, then he is accounted τῷ ὄντι Ἰουδαῖος, *a right Jew*: and calls one that is a counterfeit Proselyte to them, παραβαπτιστὴν, *one that puts an abuse upon their Ceremony of Baptism.*

This solemn baptizing of Proselytes differ'd from the rest of their *divers Baptisms* (which St. *Paul*, *Heb.* 9. 10. says were customary among the Jews) in this; that those others were upon new occasions of uncleanness, &c. many times repeated: but this was never given but once to one Person. It was called (as Dr. *Lightfoot* shews (g), *Baptism for Proselytism*, distinct from *Baptism for Uncleanness.*

§. 2. It is not very material to our purpose to inquire upon what Reasons or Authorities this custom of the Jews of baptizing all Proselytes was grounded. All that is material, is to know that they had time out of Mind such a custom. And for that, the Sayings of their own Writers here produc'd are a sufficient Evidence. Yet I shall spend a few Words in shewing how they prove the necessity of this Washing, or Baptizing, from *Moses*'s Law.

They take notice that *Moses Numb.* 15. 15. orders thus, *One Ordinance shall be both for you of the Congregation, and also for the Stranger* [or Proselyte] *that sojourns with you. An Ordinance for ever in your Generations: As you are,*

(f) Differt. in Epictet, l. 2. c. 9. (g) Hor. Heb. on Mat 3. 6.

*are, so shall the Stranger be before the Lord. One Law and one manner shall be for you and for the Stranger*, &c. Now they reckon that the *Israelites* themselves were at their entring into Covenant with God at the time of their receiving the Law in Mount Sinai, all of 'em washed or baptized. So they understand those Words, *Exod.* 19. 10. *And the* Lord *said unto* Moses; *Go unto all the People and* sanctifie *them to day and to morrow, and let 'em wash their Clothes, and be ready against the third day: and the third day the Lord will come down*, &c. They understand the meaning of that Command by which *Moses* was to sanctifie the People on those two days, to be the washing of 'em: and so that word, *to sanctifie*, does commonly signifie in the Jewish Law (as several Writers have shown by many instances, and I also do in this Book (h) give some) especially when 'tis spoken of a Man sanctifying other Men. And *Maimonides, Mickvaoth. it. More Nebochim. Pt.* 3. *c.* 33. says; This is a Rule; that *wheresoever in the Law the washing of the Body or Garments is mention'd, it means still the washing of the whole Body.* And the same is affirmed; *Gemara Babyl. Tit. Jabimoth. c.* 4. *Fol.* 46. And so *Aben Ezra*, on that place of Scripture (i) where *Jacob* being to meet with God at *Bethel*, said to his houshold; *Be clean, and change your Garments*; understands *the washing of their Bodies.* And *Selden* (k) shews by the Expositions which the Jewish Commentators give on *Levit.* 11. 25, 28, 40. *Levit.* 14. 8, 47. *Numb.* 19. 10, 21. *Numb.* 31. 24. and several other Texts where washing of Garments is mention'd, that they always understand washing of the whole Body. And for the like understanding of the foresaid place in *Exod.* 19. 10. quotes *Mechilta. Nachmanid. R. Bechai. Moses Mikotsi*, &c.

That they gave this (Baptism of the Jews, and the command for Proselytes to be as the Jews were) as a proof that Proselytes must be baptiz'd, appears by the words of *Maimonides* in the place before quoted. For he first says thus; *By three things did* Israel *enter into Covenant, by Circumcision, and Baptism, and Sacrifice. Circumcision was in* Ægypt, *as it is Written*; no Uncircumcised (l) Person shall eat thereof, *&c. Baptism was in the*



(h) Pt. 1. CH. XI. §. 11. (i) Gen. 35. 2. (k) De Synedr. l. 1. c. 3. (l) Exod. 12. 48.

*Wilderness just before the giving of the Law: as it is Written* (m); sanctifie them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their Cloths. *And Sacrifice: as it is said* (n), And he sent young Men of the Sons of *Israel* which offer'd Burnt-offerings, *&c.*

And then he adds that which I recited before concerning Proselytes; *And so in all Ages when an Ethnic is willing*, &c. *he must be Circumcised, and Baptized, and bring a Sacrifice: As it is written*; As you are, so shall the Stranger be, *&c.*

And so says the *Talmud. Tract. Repud.*

Israel *does not enter into Covenant but by these three things, by Circumcision, Baptism, and Peace Offering: And the Proselytes in like manner.*

And again, *ad Tit. Cherithoth. c.* 2.

*As you are so shall the Stranger be.* As you are, *that is; as was done to your Fathers. And what was done to them? Your Fathers did not enter into Covenant but by Circumcision, and Baptism, and sprinkling of Blood. So neither do Proselytes enter into Covenant, but by Circumcision, and Baptism, and sprinkling of Blood.*

And *Rabbi Solomon. in loc.*

*Our Rabbies teach that our Fathers enter'd into Covenant by Circumcision, and Baptism, and sprinkling of Blood*, &c.

The ancient Christians, especially such of 'em as liv'd in places where they could have converse with the Learned Jews, and might learn from them the meaning of the *Hebrew* Phrases used in the old Testament, do also speak of this Baptism of the Jews.

So *Gregory Nazianzen. Orat.* 39. shewing the preference of the Christian Baptism before the Jewish, says, Ἐβάπτισε Μωσῆς ἀλλ' ἐν ὕδατι· καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ τυπικῶς· καὶ τοῦτο ἦν, ὡς καὶ Παύλῳ δοκεῖ, &c. Moses *gave a Baptism, but that was with Water only. And before that, they were baptiz'd in the Cloud and in the Sea. But these were but a Type* [or, Figure] *of ours; as* Paul *also understands it.*

And St. *Cyprian. Epist.* 73. *ad Jubaianum.*

*Alia enim fuit Judæorum sub Apostolis ratio: alia est Gentilium conditio. Illi quia jam legis & Moysi antiquissimum*

(m) Exod. 19. 10. (n) Exod. 24. 5.

*ſnum baptiſma fuerant adepti, in nomine quoque Jeſu Chriſti erant baptizandi.*

'The caſe of the Jews who were to be baptiz'd by the Apoſtles was different from the caſe of the Gentiles; for the Jews had already, and a long time ago, the Baptiſm of the Law and of *Moſes*; and were now to be baptiz'd in the Name of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

Alſo St. *Baſil* in his Oration of Baptiſm, compares together the Baptiſms of *Moſes*, of *John*, and of *Chriſt*. Whoſe Words I ſhall quote *Pt.* 1. *CH. XII.* § 7. of this Collection.

And Mr. *Selden. de Synedr. l.* 1. *c.* 3. obſerves that that ſaying of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. *All our Fathers were baptized unto* Moſes *in the Cloud and in the Sea*, would have been difficult for thoſe to whom St. *Paul* wrote, to make any ſenſe of; had it not been a thing well known at that time when the Apoſtle wrote, that the *Jews* look'd upon themſelves as having been enter'd into Covenant by Baptiſm: and that St. *Paul* ſpoke as alluding to that. And Dr. *Hammond* concludes the ſame *(o)*.

§. 3. Secondly, It is to be obſerv'd, that if any ſuch Proſelyte who came over to the Jewiſh Religion and was baptiz'd into it, had any Infant Children then born to him; they alſo were at the Father's Deſire circumcis'd and baptiz'd, and admitted as Proſelytes. The Child's Inability to declare or promiſe for himſelf was not look'd on as a Bar againſt his Reception into the Covenant: but the Deſire of his Father to dedicate him to the true God, was counted available and ſufficient to juſtifie his Admiſſion. So that it was with ſuch a Proſelyte, as it was with *Abraham* at his firſt Admiſſion to the Covenant of Circumciſion: As *Abraham* of 99 year old, and *Iſhmael* his Son of 13 year old, and all the Males in his Houſe that were 8 Days old or upward, were circumcis'd at the ſame time; ſo ſuch a Proſelyte, with all his, were both baptiz'd (and circumcis'd if they were male Children) and had each of 'em a Sacrifice (ſuch as was by Law *(p)* requir'd for a *Jews* Child) made for 'em: but if Females; they were baptiz'd, and a Sacrifice was offer'd for 'em.



(o) Six Queries. Inf. bapt. §. 7, 8. (p) Luke 2. 24.

And the Reason which the Jewish Writers give, why it was not necessary to stay to see whether the Child, when come to age, would be willing to engage himself in the Covenant of the true God, or not, is this; That it is out of the reach of any Doubt or Controversie, that *this is for his good.* Where there may be any Question made whether a thing be beneficial, or not; the Concerns of a Child are not to be disposed of by another: but here the Benefit of being dedicated to *Jehovah* (of which Dedication these Rites were the Sacrament and Seal) is evident and unquestionable. One may (as they give the Reason) *privilege a Person, tho' he be uncapable of knowing it: but one ought not to disprivilege a Person without his Knowledge.*

They judge therefore that a Proselyte had no more need to expect his Child's Consent to be cleansed by this Baptism or Washing from the unclean and accursed Estate in which he was born, than a natural *Jew* had to make any such Delay in giving his Child Circumcision, the Seal of the Covenant. Which Delay, instead of being cautious, would have been impious. This Reason of theirs will appear in their Sayings, which I am now going to produce.

*Gemara Babylon. Chetuboth. c. 1. fol. 11.*

*If with a Proselyte his Sons and his Daughters be made Proselytes; that which is done by their Father redound to their Good.*

And 'tis not only the *Gemara* (which perhaps some will object against, as not being antient enough) but the Text of the *Misna* it self, both in the *Babylonian* and in the *Jerusalem Talmud*, which speaks at that place of a Child becoming, or being made, a Proselyte. For the *Jerusalem Misna* says, that if a Girl born of heathen Parents *be made a Proselyte after she be three Year and a Day old*; then she is not to have such and such Privileges there mention'd. And that of the *Babylon* Edition says, that if she *be made a Proselyte before that Age*, she shall have the said Privileges. Both agreeing (as *Selden* reciting (*q*) those places observes) that a Child of never so little Age might by their custom be made a Proselyte. And then the *Gemara* there gives the Reason, or rather takes

(*q*) De Synedriis, l. 1. c. 3.

takes off the Objection which might be made because of their Nonage, saying;

*They are wont to baptize* such *a Proselyte in Infancy upon the Profession of the House of Judgment* [the Court] *For this is for his good.*

And the *Gloss* there (having first put in an exception, that if the Father of the Child be alive and present, the Child is baptiz'd at his request: but if not, on the Profession of the Court) comments thus on those words.

They are wont to baptize. *Because,* says the Gloss, *none is made a Proselyte without Circumcision and Baptism.* Upon the profession of the House of Judgment. *That is, the three Men have the care of his Baptism, according to the Law of the Baptism of Proselytes, which requires three Men: who do so become to him a Father. And he is by them made a Proselyte,* &c.

So that, as *Selden* there expresses it, *A Proselyte, if of age, made profession to the Court, that he would keep* Moses's *Law. But in the case of Minors, the Court it self did profess in their Name the same thing. Just as in the Christian Church the Godfathers do: at least, if their Parents were not there to do it for 'em.*

And *Maimonides* in the Chapter I quoted before, *Issuri Bia. c.* 13. §. 7. after he has discours'd what I there recited of the Baptism of grown Persons made Proselytes, adds the same that the *Gemara* had said.

*A Proselyte that is under age they are wont to baptize upon the Knowledge* [or Profession] *of the House of judgment* [or Court] *Because this is for his good.*

If a Child were fatherless, and his Mother brought him; they baptiz'd him at her Desire: but the Court professed for him. As the *Gemara* says at the place forecited.

Concerning the Age of the Child to be baptized, they had this Rule: *Any male Child* of such a Proselyte, *that was under the Age of* 13 *Years and a Day; and Females that were under* 12 *Years and a Day,* they baptized as Infants at the Request and by the Assent of the Father, or the Authority of the Court: because such an one *was not yet the Son of Assent*; as they phrase it, *i. e.* not capable to give assent for himself: *but the thing is for his good.* If they were above that age, they consented for themselves. This *Selden* shews, both in his Book *de jure Nat. & Gent. juxta Hebræos, l.* 2. *c.* 2. and also *de Synedr. l.* 1. *c.* 3. by particulars too large to be inserted here.

*Rabbi*

*Rabbi Joseph* indeed gives this Sentence, that when they grow to years, they may retract. Where the *Gloss* writes thus; *this is to be understood of little Children, who are made Proselytes together with their Fathers.* And the same is the Opinion of some People concerning Christians Children baptized in Infancy. But the Council of *Trent* anathematizes (*r*) this Opinion.

What has been said of the Baptism of Children of Proselytes, is to be understood of such Children as were born before the Parents themselves were baptized: for all the Children that were born to them afterward, they reckon'd were clean by their Birth; as being born of Parents that were cleansed from the polluted State of Heathenism, and that were in the Covenant of *Abraham*, and were become as natural Jews. They therefore did by them only the same thing that the natural Jews did by their Children: that is, for the Male Children they used Circumcision, and Sacrifice or Offering: and for the Females only a Sacrifice.

Dr. *Hammond* did indeed once maintain the contrary in a Dispute (*s*) with Mr. *Selden* and Mr. *Tombs*: and thought that both the Children of natural Jews were wont to be baptized; and also the Children of Proselytes born after their Parents Baptism. But the learned Men that have since made a more exact Enquiry in the Books of the learned Jews, have found and given their Verdict, that *Selden* was in the right; and the Doctor in a Mistake in that matter. And Bp. *Taylor*, Mr. *Walker*, &c. have followed him in that Mistake.

The natural Jews reckon'd that neither they themselves nor their Children did stand in any need of this Baptism, never since the time (which I mention'd before) when their whole Nation, Men, Women, and Infants, were baptized before the giving of the Law on mount *Sinai*. 'Twas our Saviour who first order'd by himself and by his forerunner, that every particular Person, *Jew* or *Gentile*, or of what Parents soever born, must be *born* (*t*) *again of Water*. As for the Proselytes Baptism, it was a Rule among 'em, as Mr. *Selden* shews (*u*) that it *was never reiterated on him or his Posterity*. And as

(*r*) Sess. 7. Can. de Baptismo. 14. (*s*) Defence of Inf. Bapt.
(*t*) John 3. 3, 5. (*u*) De jure Nat. & Gent. l. 2, c. 2.

as other learned Men do ſhew, that *Filius baptizati habetur pro baptizato.* "He that is born of a baptized Parent "is accounted as baptized. And Dr. *Lightfoot* gives this as their Rule, *The Sons of Proſelytes, in following Generations were circumciſed indeed; but not baptized--- as being already* Iſraelites.

And tho' the Child were begotten and conceived in the Womb before the Parents were baptiz'd; yet if they (and particularly if the Mother) were baptized before it was born into the World, the Jews had a Saying (which is quoted by (x) Dr. *Hammond* himſelf) recorded by *Maimonides. Iſſ. Bia. c.* 13. and alſo in the *Talmud.*

*A heathen Woman, if ſhe is made a Proſelyteſs when big with Child; that Child needs not Baptiſm: for the Baptiſm of the Mother ſerves him for Baptiſm.*

§ 4. Thirdly, This is alſo plainly prov'd and agreed by all the learned Men aforeſaid and by all others, to have been the cuſtom of the Jews; that if they found any Child that had been expos'd in the Fields, Woods, or High-Ways by the Heathens; or if they took in War any Infant Children, whom they brought home as Booty, and intended to bring 'em up in their Religion; they baptiz'd 'em in Infancy, and acccounted 'em as Proſelytes. So ſays,

*Maimonides. Halach Aibdim. c.* 8.

*An* Iſraelite *that takes a little heathen Child, or that finds an heathen Infant, and baptizes him for a Proſelyte: Behold he is a Proſelyte.*

At this Baptiſm of ſuch a Child the Owner of him was wont to determine whether he ſhould be a Slave or a Freeman: and he was baptiz'd in the Name of the one or of the other accordingly. To which purpoſe is that Rule of *Rabbi Hezekiah,* ſet down in the

*Hieroſol. Jevamoth. fol.* 8. 4.

*Behold, one finds an Infant caſt out, and baptizes him in the Name of a Servant: Do thou alſo circumciſe him in the Name of a Servant. But if he baptize him in the Name of a Freeman: Do thou alſo circumciſe him in the Name of a Freeman.*

Theſe Caſes were very frequent. For beſides that many Proſelytes of the *Gentiles* came over with their Children;

(x) Six Quær. Inf. bapt. §. 109.

Children; The Jews custom in War was to bring away the Children of the People whom they conquer'd, that they might either make Servants of 'em, or if they took a liking to 'em, adopt them for their own. And 'twas a common thing with the Heathens to expose their Infants, whom they would not be at the charge to bring up, in the High-Ways, &c. So that Dr. *Lightfoot* says (y) *The baptizing of Infants was a thing as well known in the Church of the Jews, as ever it has been in the Christian Church.*

§ 5. Now this gives great Light for the better understanding the meaning of our Saviour, when he bids his Apostles (z), *Go and Disciple all the Nations, and baptize 'em.* For when a Commission is given in such short Words, and there is no express Direction what they shall do with the Infants of those who become Proselytes; the natural and obvious Interpretation is, that they must do in that matter as they and the Church in which they liv'd always used to do.

As now at this time, if an Island or Country of Heathens be discover'd, and a Minister be sent out to them by the Bishops of the Church of *England*, who should say, *Go and convert such a Nation and baptize 'em*; He would know without asking any Question, that he must baptize the Infants of those who being converted, offer'd them to Baptism; because he knows that to be the Meaning and the Custom of that Church or Bishop by which he is sent. And on the contrary, if any one were sent from a Church or Congregation of Antipædobaptists with a Commission of the same Words, *Go and convert such a Nation and baptize 'em*; He would take it for granted that he must baptize none of their Infants, because he knows that to be contrary to the meaning and custom of the Church that sends him.

So when the Apostles were sent out to the Heathen Nations with a Commission of no other Words than these, *Go and disciple* [or proselyte] *all the Nations, baptizing 'em in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:* when the case came in hand of the Infant Children of those that were *discipled*, what could they think other, but that they must do with 'em as had been usually

(y) Hor. Hebr. on Mat. 3. 6. (z) Mat. 28. 19.

usually done in that Church in which they and their Master had always liv'd? Since the Nations were to be proselyted, how could they, without particular Order, alter any thing in the customary way of receiving Proselytes of the Nations? For to *disciple* the Nations to Christ, is the same thing as to *proselyte* 'em to him: and probably in the *Hebrew* Text of St. *Matthew* was the same Word. And we see that the customary Phrase and Language of the Jews was to call the Infants, *young Proselytes*, or *Disciples*: as I shall shew (*a*) that *Justin Martyr*, one of the eldest Christian Writers, calls the Christian Infants likewise.

If our Saviour meant that the Apostles should make any Alteration in that matter, and not baptize the Infants as had been usually done; it is a wonder He did not say so.

The Antipædobaptists depend upon this as an unerring Rule; that since our Saviour did not say (or at least St. *Matthew* does not recite that he said) *Baptize the Infants also*; his meaning must have been that they should not baptize 'em.

But if they would put this case; Suppose our Saviour had bid the Apostles, *Go and disciple all the Nations, and* (instead of baptizing had said) *circumcise 'em*: An Antipædobaptist will grant that in that case, without any more Words, the Apostles must have circumcised the Infants of the Nations as well as the grown Men, tho' there had been no express Mention of Infants in the Commission: So that that is not always an unerring Rule.

And what is the reason that in case Circumcision had been appointed for the Nations, it must have been of course given to Infants tho' they had not been expressly named? The reason is this; because the Apostles knew of themselves that Circumcision was usually given to Infants. If it do appear then, that Baptism was also usually given to Infants, and the Apostles must know it; the same Reason would direct 'em to the same Interpretation.

If it had been Circumcision that had been order'd, the Apostles going out into the Nations must have circumcised the grown Men at the Age that they found them

(*a*) Pt. 1. CH. II. §. 6.

them of: but they would have circumcised the Infants also; because one that is to be circumcised at all should be circumcised in Infancy, if one has then the Power or Direction of him. So they must baptize the grown Men among the Nations at the Age that they found them of: and we have reason to conclude that they must think themselves oblig'd to give Baptism (or order it to be given) to the Infants also; because by the Rules of Baptism received in their Nation all that were to be baptiz'd at all, were baptiz'd in Infancy; if they had then the Power and Direction of 'em.

And tho' the Proof that Circumcision was usually given to Infants, is taken from the Writings of the Old Testament, but the Proof that Baptism was usually given to the Infants of Proselytes is taken only from the Testimonies of the Jews themselves: yet the Jews themselves (how fallible soever they are in judging of the meaning of the Law, what ought to be done, or how necessary it was, yet) cannot fail of being sufficient Witnesses of the matter of Fact, and able to tell what was actually done among themselves.

The difference which the Jews made between themselves and other Nations in giving Baptism to *Gentile* Proselytes and their Children, but not to themselves nor their own Children, does not at all affect the Question that is disputed between the Christian Pædobaptists and Antipædobaptists: because in respect of the Christian Religion the Jews themselves have the same need of becoming Proselytes and of being baptized, that other Nations have. The Gospel has concluded all under Sin: and St. *Paul* speaking of this very matter of Baptism (*b*) says, that in respect of it *there is neither* Jew *nor* Greek, *i. e.* there is no difference between 'em. The Jews themselves do seem to have understood that when the *Christ* came, their Nation must be baptiz'd as well as others: and therefore they ask'd *John* (who baptized Jews) *why* (*c*) *baptizest thou then, if thou be not that* Christ, *nor* Elias? &c. signifying that if he had been the *Christ* or *Elias*; they should not have wonder'd at his baptizing of Jews.

The same thing is to be said of that Tenet of the Jews, that the Infant Children of a Proselyte, born to him

(*b*) Gal. 3. 27, 28. (*c*) John 1. 25.

him before his Baptism, are to be baptized; but not the Children born to him after his Baptism, nor any of their Posterity in any succeeding Generations, they being now look'd on as natural Jews.

This, I say, does not affect the Question of Christian Pædobaptism. Because that Privilege which the Jew had, or supposed himself to have, above other People, is as to the Christian Dispensation abolish'd: and because both the Pædobaptists and Antipædobaptists are agreed that all Persons do now need Baptism; as well those that are born of baptized, as those that are born of unbaptized Parents: our Saviour having satisfied *Nicodemus* (*d*) that *that which is born of the Flesh* (whether of a Jewish or Gentile, baptized or unbaptized Parent) *is Flesh*; and *must be born again.*

The Antipædobaptists are satisfied of this. The only Question is, at what Age they must be baptized. Now the Practice of the Jews before and in our Saviour's time was; that all Persons whom they baptiz'd at all, they baptiz'd in Infancy, if they had, as I said, the Power or Possession of 'em in Infancy. And in this matter our Saviour gave no Direction for any Alteration. *He took* (as Dr. *Lightfoot* (*e*) says) *into his Hands Baptism such as he found it: adding only this, that he exalted it to a nobler purpose and to a larger use.*

Some *Socinians* indeed would have the use of Baptism to be abolish'd in all Christian Nations, where the body of the People has once been generally baptiz'd: and do say of Christian Baptism, as the Jews did of theirs; that the Baptism of the Forefathers is sufficient for them and all their Posterity. This Reason against the Continuance of Baptism, which was never thought a Reason by any Christians before, *Socinus* gave about 150 year ago; *Water Baptism* (*f*) *seems unnecessary for those that are born of Christians, and do imitate their Parents in the Profession of Christianity. It matters not whether such be baptiz'd or not. And if they be, 'tis all one whether it be at their adult Age or in Infancy.* Which Opinion, or one more against Baptism, the *Quakers* have since taken up. But the Antipædobaptists do hold it necessary, as I said, for every particular Person, and not only

(*d*) John 3. 6, 7. (*e*) Hor. Hebr. in Mat. 3. 6. (*f*) Epist. de baptismo, apud Vossium de Baptismo, Disp. 13.

only for a Nation at the first planting of Christianity.

And 'tis easie to guess what it was that swayed *Socinus* into the other Opinion: *viz.* his Desire of abolishing the Doctrine of the Trinity: which it was hard to accomplish so long as Persons were continually baptiz'd into that Faith.

There never was any Age (at least since *Abraham*) in which the Children, whether of Jews or Proselytes, that were admitted into Covenant, had not some Badge or Sign of such their admission. The Male Children of *Abraham*'s Race were enter'd by Circumcision. The whole body of the Jews, Men, Women, and Children, were in *Moses*'s time baptiz'd. After which the Male Children of Proselytes, that were enter'd with their Parents, were (as well as their Parents) admitted by Circumcision, Baptism, and a Sacrifice: the Female Children by Baptism and a Sacrifice. The Male Children of the natural Jews, and such Male Children of Proselytes as were born after their Parents Baptism, by Circumcision and a Sacrifice: and the Female Children by a Sacrifice offer'd for them by the head of the Family. Now after that Circumcision and Sacrifice were to be abolish'd, there was nothing left but Baptism, or Washing, for a Sign of the Covenant and of professing Religion. This our Saviour took (probably as being the easiest and the least operose of all the rest; and as being common to both Sexes, making no difference of Male or Female) and injoin'd it *(g) to all that should enter into the Kingdom of God.* And St. *Paul* does plainly intimate to the *Colossians*, *ch.* 2. *v.* 11, 12. that it served them instead of Circumcision: calling it, *the Circumcision of Christ*; or *Christian Circumcision.*

The Baptism indeed of the Nations by the Apostles ought to be regulated by the Practice of *John* and of *Christ* himself (who by the hands of his Disciples baptized many Jews) rather than by any preceeding Custom of the Jewish Nation; if we had any good ground to believe that they did in the case of Infants differ, or alter any thing from the usual way. But we have no kind of proof that they made any such alteration. The Commission which our Saviour gave to his Disciples to baptize in the Country

(g) John 3. 5.

try of *Judæa* during his abode with them, is not at all set down, as I said. And what *John* did in this particular, we have no means left to know, but by observing what was done before and after.

There is no express mention indeed of any Children baptized by him. But to those that consider the commonness of the thing (which I have here shewn) for People that came to be baptiz'd to bring their Children along with 'em, that is no more a cause to think that he baptized no Children, than one's minding that in the History of the old Testament there is sometimes 500 year together without the mention of any Child circumcis'd, is a cause to think that none were circumcis'd all that while. And whereas 'tis said of the Multitudes that came to *John*, that they were baptiz'd by him, *confessing their Sins* (which Confession can be understood only of the grown persons) That is no more than would be said in the case of a Minister of the Church of *England* (which I put before) going and converting a heathen Nation. For in a short account which should be sent of his Success, it would be said that Multitudes came, and were baptiz'd *confessing their Sins:* and there would need no mention of their bringing their Children with 'em: because the converting of the grown Persons was the principal and most difficult thing; and it would be suppos'd that they brought their Children of course.

I shall at *CH. XIII.* of this my Collection, shew that St. *Ambrose* does take it for granted that *John* must have baptiz'd Infants as well as others, for he does by way of Allusion make a comparison between *Elias* and him: and speaks of *Elias*'s turning the Waters of *Jordan* back toward the Spring head, as a Type of that Baptism *of Infants* by St. *John*, by which they were reformed from their natural corrupt state, back again to the primitive Innocence of Nature. And St. *Ambrose* does not there stand to prove that any *Infants* were baptiz'd by him: but speaks of it as of a thing commonly so understood by all Christians. And so Dr. *Lightfoot* says on this account (*h*): *I don't believe, the People that flocked to* John's *Baptism were so forgetful of the manner and custom of the Nation, as not to bring their little Children along with them to be baptiz'd.*



(*h*) Hor. Hebr. on Mat. 3.

And the same Man, who was most excellently skill'd in the Books and Customs of the Jews, says at another place; (*i*) *If Baptism and baptizing Infants had been a new thing, and unheard of till* John Baptist *came, as Circumcision was till God appointed it to* Abraham, *there would have been, no doubt, as express command for baptizing Infants, as there was for circumcising 'em. But when the baptizing of Infants was a thing commonly known and used, as appears by unconteſtable Evidence from their Writers; there need not be expreſs Aſſertions that ſuch and ſuch Perſons were to be the Object of Baptiſm: when it was as well known, before the Goſpel began, that Men, Women, and Children were baptiz'd, as it is to be known that the Sun is up, when*, &c.

And he deduces the Argument with great Evidence in this fashion (*k*);

'The whole Nation knew well enough that Infants 'were wont to be baptiz'd. There was no need of a 'Precept for that which was always settled by common 'use. Suppose there should at this time come out a Pro-'clamation in these Words; *Every one on the Lord's-'day shall repair to the public Assembly in the Church.* That 'Man would dote, who should in times to come con-'clude that there were no Prayers, Sermons, Psalms, *&c.* 'in the public Assemblies on the Lord's-day, for this rea-'son, because there was no mention of 'em in this Pro-'clamation. For the Proclamation order'd the keeping 'of the Lord's-Day in the public Assemblies in general: 'and there was no need that mention should be made 'of the particular kinds of Divine Worship there to be 'used; since they were both before and at the time of 'the said Proclamation known to every body, and in 'common use.

'Just so the case stood as to Baptism. Christ order'd 'it to be for a Sacrament of the New Testament, by 'which all should be admitted to the Profession of the 'Gospel, as they were formerly to Proselytism in the 'Jews Religion. The particular Circumstances of it, 'as, the manner of baptizing, the Age of receiving it, 'which Sex was capable of it, *&c.* had no need of 'being regulated or set down, because they were known 'to every body by common usage. 'It

(*i*) Harmony on *John* 1, 25. (*k*) Hor. Heb. on Mat. 3,

'It was therefore necessary on the other side, that 'there should have been an express and plain Order that 'Infants and little Children should not be baptiz'd, if 'our Saviour had meant that they should not. For since 'it was ordinary in all Ages before, to have Infants ba-'ptized; if Christ would have had that usage to be 'abolish'd, he would have expresly forbidden it. So 'that his and the Scriptures Silence in this matter does 'confirm and establish Infant Baptism for ever.

§. 6. Fourthly. Another thing observable about the Jewish Baptism of Proselytes, is this; that they called such an one's Baptism, his *new-birth, regeneration*, or *being born again.*

This was a very usual Phrase of the Jews.

*Gemara. tit. jevamoth. c. 4. fol. 62. 1.*

*If any one become a Proselyte; He is like a Child new born.*

*Maimonides. Iss. Bia. c. 14. §. 11.*

*The Gentile that is made a Proselyte; and the Slave that is made free: Behold, he is like a Child new born.*

The Rabbies do much enlarge on this privilege of a Proselyte's being put into a new State, and putting off all his former Relations: Those that were akin to him before, are now no longer so; but he is just as if he were born of a new Mother, as the *Talmud* often expresses it. And 'twas probably from the much talk that they made on this Subject, that *Tacitus* the *Roman* Historian (who liv'd in the Apostles time) drew the notion he had of the Jews practice in initiating Proselytes.

*The first thing*, saies he, (*l*) *that they teach 'em, is, to despise the Gods* [which they worshipp'd before] *to renounce their Country:* Parentes, liberos, fratres, vilia habere, *to make no account of their Parents, Children, or Kindred.*

And some do think that St. *Paul* alludes to this notion, when he saies, 1 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Henceforth know we no man after the Flesh*, &c. *If any one be in Christ, he is* a new Creature. *Old things are passed away*, &c. And St. *Peter*, when he calls the Christians, *new born Babes.*

The *Talmudical* Doctors do indeed carry on this Metaphor of the new Birth too far in all reason: they determine that it is no Incest for such an one to marry



(*l*) Hist. l. 5. c. 5.

any of his nearest Kindred, because upon his being new born all former Relations do cease; so that if he marry his own Mother, he does not sin.

But letting pass the vain and absurd consequences which they drew from this figurative Speech, 'tis abundantly evident that the common phrase of the Jews was to call the Baptism of a Proselyte, *his Regeneration*, or new birth.

And the Christians did in all antient times continue the use of this Name for Baptism: so as that they never use the word [regenerate] or [born again] but that they mean or denote by it Baptism. Of which I shall produce no proof here, because almost all the Quotations which I shall bring in this Book, will be instances of it.

Now the Knowledge of this makes those words of our Saviour to *Nicodemus* in the 3*d* chap. of St. *John* to be much more intelligible to us, where he tells him, that *Except any one be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.* He used that which was then the ordinary phrase. All that was new in that saying of our Saviour, was this; The Jews knew, that any *Gentile* that would enter the Kingdom of God, must be born again: but our Saviour assures *Nicodemus*, that *every one*, Jew or Gentile, must be so born. And when *Nicodemus* did not apprehend his meaning, but took the words in a proper sense, our Saviour speaks plainer, and saies, that *every one must be born* of Water, *&c.* wondring at the same time that he, being a Master in *Israel*, had not understood him.

This puts it beyond all doubt that our Saviour is to be understood there, of Baptism (of which some People, since the disuse of the word [*regenerated*, or *born again*] for [baptized] have made a doubt) and also guides us into a ready conception of the sense of those sayings of the ancient Christian Writers where they use the word; and of St. *Paul* for one, when he mentions *the Washing of Regeneration.* (*m*)

There are some other more plain and gross Mistakes made by some Men in the Understanding of those words of our Saviour to *Nicodemus*: As, that of those who being able to read none but the *English* Translation, where 'tis worded; *Except a Man be born again*, &c. do conceive that they concern only grown Men. And that of those

(*m*) Tit. 3. 5.

those who tell us, that by the *Kingdom of God* in that Text is meant, not the Kingdom of Glory, but something else. The absurdity of which mistakes will be occasionally shewn in the following Collection of the Sayings of the eldest Christians, who do very frequently quote this Text.

§. 7. It may be useful to illustrate the point in hand, if we do here institute a parallel between the Jewish and the Christian Baptism, and the Modes and Circumstances used in each: by which it will more plainly appear that St. *John*, and our Saviour, and the Apostles and Primitive Christians had an eye to the Jewish Baptism in many of the Rites and Circumstances which they used at the Administration of the Christian Baptism. As all agree they had to the Jewish Passover in the ordering of the other Sacrament.

1. As there was a stipulation made by the whole people of the Jews just before their Baptism. *Exod.* 19. 5. *If you will keep my Covenant*, &c. The people answering, *ver.* 8. *All that the Lord has spoken we will do*, &c. *And* Moses *returned the words of the people to the Lord*, &c. And the Lord said, *ver.* 10. *Go and sanctifie 'em, and let 'em wash their Cloths* [i. e. their whole Bodies].

And as the *Jews* did accordingly afterwards require of any that were to be proselyted or enter'd as Disciples to their Religion, a Stipulation to renounce Idolatry, *&c. Maimonid. Iss. Bia. c.* 13. §. 14, 15. And to believe in *Jehovah.*

So the *Christians* requir'd a like sort of Stipulation of all whom they baptized: And being taught, that all Idolatry is *offering to Devils*; they express'd it, *Renouncing the Devil and all his Works*, &c. And to believe in the Trinity. From whence it is probably, that St. *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* 3. 21. calls Baptism ἐπερώτημα the interrogation or stipulation of a good conscience.

2. As the *Jews*, tho' the person to be baptiz'd had before made this profession, yet interrogated him again as he stood in the Water: as appears by the words of *Maimonides*, quoted §. 1.

So the Christians requir'd of all adult persons that were to be baptiz'd, that beside the profession made before in the Congregation, they should answer to each Interrogatory of it over again, when they are going into the Water; as I shew *Pt.* 2. *CH. IX.* §. 13.

3. As the Jews baptized the Infant Children of such Proselytes as desir'd that their Children should be enter'd into Covenant with the true God. So I have, thro' all the first Part of this Work, given the History of what the *Christians* did in respect of the Infant Children of Christian Proselytes. And I believe all impartial Readers of it will conclude that they did the same.

4. As the *Jews* requir'd, that for an Infant Proselyte either his Father or else the Consistory [or Church] of the place, or at least three grave Persons, should answer, or undertake at his Baptism (And they requir'd the like at Circumcision, as *Buxtorf* in his *Synag. Jud.* has fully shewn; and is not by any denied).

So the *Christians* (as I shall shew at *Pt.* 2. *CH. IX.* §. 13. did the same: putting the several Interrogatories of the Creed, and of the Renuntiations, and requiring the Child's Answer by his Parents, or other Sponsors.

5. As such a Proselyte of the *Jews*, when baptiz'd, was said to be *born again.* So our Saviour, and the Apostles, and primitive Christians gave the same Term to *Christian* Baptism. As appears *John* 3. 3, 5. *Tit.* 3. 5. and in almost all the passages of this my Collection.

6. The *Jews* told such a Proselyte, that he was now taken out of his *unclean* State, and put into a State of *Sanctity*, or *Holiness*, *Iss. Bia. c.* 14. §. 14.

So the Scriptures of the New Testament do call the baptized *Christians*, the *Saints*, the *Holy*, the *Sanctified* in Christ *Jesus*; and say, that the Church of them is *sanctified with the washing of Water*, &c. *Rom.* 1. 7. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *it.* 7. 14. *Eph.* 5. 26. And it will appear by many Quotations which I shall produce from the antient *Christians*, that there is nothing more common with them than to call Baptism by the Name of *Sanctification*, and to say [sanctified] or [holy] instead of [baptized], and to give to Persons, while they continued unbaptized, the Name of [unclean].

7. The *Jews* declared the baptized Proselyte to be now under the Wings of the Divine Majesty, or *Shechinah. Iss. Bia. c.* 13. §. 4.

This was more visibly made good to the new baptized *Christians*, by palpable Signs and Effects of the Holy Spirit coming on 'em. And as the laying on of the Hands of an Apostle was in the primitive Church imployed to procure this (or of a Bishop as the Supream Pastor when the Apostles were dead, for obtaining the more

more ordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit ) So there is good Reason to believe that the Jews had before used this Ceremony of laying on of Hands on this Occasion: for it was a thing used by them on almost all Occasions that were solemn.

8. The *Paschal* Season is known to have been the most solemn time both with the *Jews* and *Christians* for admitting Proselytes or Disciples by Baptism. The Jews did then baptize all the Proselytes that were ready, for this Reason; that they might be admitted to partake of the Passover and Sacrifices. The Christians observ'd the same time for a like Reason.

9. In the Jews time, some Gentiles were absolute Idolaers; some came nearer to the Jews Religion, believing their God to be the true God, and were called *Proselytes of the Gate.* And of these last some, who declar'd their Desire to be circumcis'd and baptiz'd and submit to the whole Law, were (for some time before their Circumcision and Baptism) distinguish'd from the rest.

So in the first preachings of Christianity in heathen places some slighted it. Some gave so much regard to it, as to hear at least what the Christians preach'd; and were called *Audientes.* Some beginning to approve it submitted to a course of catechising, and were called *Catechumens.* And of these, such as desir'd Baptism and were now fit for it, were called *Competentes.*

Now both under the *Jewish* and *Christian* Dispensation, these Men as they stood in the said different degrees of Preparation to Baptism, had different Places, and Liberties of Access; both among the Jews to their Temple and Synagogues, and among the Christians to their Churches and public Offices: as is largely shewn from Jewish and Christian Antiquities by the Author (whom I mentioned before) of the *Discourse concerning Lent.*

And those degrees of preparatory Admission did so resemble one another, that 'tis plain that the first Christians imitated the Jews in the Steps that they made towards admitting a Proselyte to Baptism.

'Tis true, that sometimes a person was convinc'd, converted, and believed, and was baptized, all in a short time. As the Eunuch, the Jaylor, *&c.* But this was extraordinary; and the ordinary course was as I have said.

10. There

10. There were some other customs constantly us'd by the most antient Christians at and after the baptizing of any person, which (since they are not mention'd in any Command of our Saviour or the Apostles recorded in the New Testament) one might wonder from whence they had 'em. As namely,

1. When they baptiz'd any one, whether Infant or Adult, they thought it not enough to put him once into the Water: but as his Body was in the Water, they put his Head also three times into the Water; so that his whole Body was *three several times* under Water. This was the ordinary way (but with an Exception of sick, weakly Persons, *&c.* as I shew *Pt.* 2. *CH. IX.* §. 2, & 4.

2. And after he came out of the Water they, gave him to taste, a portion of *Milk* and *Honey* mix'd together.

3. And also they then anointed him with a sort of precious Oyntment.

The first Christians were too plain Men to invent these things of themselves. And yet they were universally used. The Books of the second Century do speak of 'em as Customs used time out of mind, and of which they knew no beginning.

The Heretics also of the same time us'd 'em: as I shew in *Pt.* 2. *CH. IX.* So that the beginning of 'em must have been from a principle universally received.

And this could not probably come but from such like customs used by the Jews at their baptizing of a Proselyte. The Author whom I last mention'd, shews the probability of this for the two last: *viz.* the *Anointing*, and the *Milk and Honey*: One a Ceremony much used by the Jews (and probably the Jewish Proselyte was anointed with the Blood of his own Sacrifice that he offer'd). The other, the Emblem of the Holy Land, to the Enjoyment whereof he was now entitled. And for the first of the three, *viz.* the trine Immersion; another Person very learned in Jewish customs assures me that their way of washing any person or any thing, that was by their Law to have a *Tevillah*, or solemn washing, was to do it three times over: So that a Vessel that was to be wash'd, was drawn three times thro' Water. Whence 'tis probable that they did the same with their Proselytes at Baptism; and that the Christians by their Example did the like.

§. 8.

§. 8. I shall conclude this Introductory Discourse with observing what a weak Attempt that is, which Sir *Norton Knatchbul* has made to disprove this custom of the Jews to baptize Proselytes; and how unlike to the rest of his Annotations on the New Testament, which are deservedly valued. That learned Gentleman seems to have had some disgust against Dr. *Hammond*, and to have endeavour'd to oppose him in several of his Criticisms and Observations. Such a prejudic'd Endeavour does often lead Men from a true Judgment of things into a vein of cavilling. The Dr. (but not he alone, but with him all that ever had any Skill in the Jewish Learning) had spoke of this custom of giving Baptism to Proselytes: and he had produc'd, among other proofs of it, a Quotation out of the *Gemara* (which I purposely omitted before, because it must be set down here) Sr. *Norton* picks out (*o*) one clause of that Quotation, which taken by it self might seem to make for his purpose: which is, that *Rabbi Eliezer* had said, *of one that was circumcis'd, and not baptiz'd, that he was a Proselyte.* Now see the Quotation at large.

*Gemara. tit. jevamoth. c. 4.*

*Of him that was circumcis'd, and not baptiz'd,* Rabbi Eliezer *said, that he was a Proselyte. Because, said he, we find of our Fathers* [Abraham, Isaac, &c.] *that they were circumcis'd, but not baptiz'd.*

*And of him that was baptiz'd and not circumcis'd,* Rabbi Joshua *said that he was a Proselyte. Because, said he, we find of our Mothers, that they were baptiz'd, and not circumcis'd.*

*But the wise Men pronounced, that till he were both baptiz'd and circumcis'd he was not a Proselyte.*

The Question here was not whether Proselytes ought, or were wont, to be baptized: but whether one that had neglected it, or by some chance had miss'd of it, could be counted for a Proselyte. And the like Question was made of one that had miss'd of Circumcision. And *Eliezer's* maintaining that one might possibly without Baptism go for a Proselyte, is no more an Argument that Proselytes were not usually *baptized*, than *Joshua's* maintaining that one might without Circumcision

(*o*) Annot. on 1 Pet. 3. 21.

sion go for a Proselyte, is an Argument that Proselytes were not usually *circumcis'd*. So far is that from being a good Conclusion which Sr. *Norton* there draws from *Eliezer's* Words; *viz.* that *he did expresly deny this Baptism.* On the contrary, the Tenor of the Discourse shews that it had been taken for granted and agreed, that a Proselyte ought of right to have both Circumcision and Baptism: only *Joshua* had a favourable Opinion against the *absolute* necessity of the first, as *Eliezer* had of the later (and both of 'em were also declared singular in such their Opinions) so that upon the whole this Quotation does prove that which Sr. *Norton Knatchbul* brought it to disprove.

I give an account in the 20th Chapter of this Book, how one *Vincentius Victor* maintained a Dispute against St. *Austin*, that a Child dying unbaptized might yet possibly be partaker of all that measure of Glory which is promis'd to Christians. From whence a certain late Antipædobaptist rais'd an Argument that *Vincentius* held that Children were not to be baptiz'd. Whereas *Vincentius's* Words do, as I there shew, sufficiently prove, that he knew that Children ought of right to have Baptism: only he puts the case of a Child that had miss'd of it. This Argument drawn from *Eliezer's* Words to prove that Proselytes were not wont to be baptiz'd, runs on the same foot, and is as weak as that. 'Tis certainly one thing to say, A Person tho' not baptiz'd might be accounted a Proselyte: Or, A Child dying unbaptized may be saved: and another very different thing to say, that either one or the other were not wont, or ought not, to be baptized. So that 'tis hard to guess what Mr. *Stennet* thinks he has gain'd to his Cause by quoting so largely this Discourse of Sr. *Norton Knatchbul* in his late Book (*p*).

Some Objections Mr. *Stennet* adds there of his own, to overthrow this Argument taken from the Jewish Baptism: As that, *If the Jews practised Baptism to initiate Proselytes; it must have been an Invention of their own: for no such Initiation is commanded in the Law of God.*

But 1. He may see that they quoted Texts in the Law of God for what they did in this matter.

And

(*p*) Answer to *Russen.* ch. 4.

And 2. Putting the caſe that they miſtook the ſenſe of thoſe Texts: yet when they had upon that Authority eſtabliſh'd a Practice of baptizing Proſelytes and their Children; and that Practice had now continued for many Ages: if our Saviour had meant that his Apoſtles in baptizing Proſelytes of the Nations ſhould have alter'd that Practice; we have all the reaſon in the World to think that he would have forewarn'd 'em of it. And ſince he did not; we have reaſon to think that the Jews were not miſtaken in what they did.

Suppoſe our Saviour had order'd his Apoſtles to require the Nations to keep the Feaſts. If he had meant that they ſhould not keep the *Feaſt of the Dedication* (which had no Divine Inſtitution, but yet being become Cuſtomary was obſerv'd by all the Jews and even by Chriſt himſelf) as well as the Paſſover and the reſt (which had been commanded in the Law) he would doubtleſs in that caſe have excepted that. And there is the ſame reaſon in the caſe before us.

But that which Mr. *Stennet* there ſays in a Challenging manner to Mr. *Ruſſen* (who had mentioned this practice of the *Jews*) *Where does he find that the Jews always did and do ſtill baptize Infants; and that, to initiate 'em into the Myſteries of Religion?* is too ſecurely ſpoken. He may ſee here, as in a Specimen, but much more largely in the Books of *Selden, Lightfoot, &c.* to which I have here referr'd, that they bring full Proofs of the antient practice of the Jews in this Matter. And that the *Jews* do ſtill continue ſo to do, there is no other Queſtion; than as it is a Queſtion whether any Proſelytes do now a-days either come over themſelves, or bring their Children to be at all initiated in their Religion: For the Books that order the initiating of Infants by Baptiſm, are ſuch as the preſent Jews do own for Orthodox and Authentick.

Sir *Norton Knatchbul* has one Argument, which I wonder much at him for uſing, and at the other for borrowing it of him: becauſe it had been very commonly anſwer'd long before he uſed it. Which is; that if baptizing of Proſelytes had been in ordinary and familiar uſe with the Jews; the *Phariſees* would not have ſaid to *John*; *Why baptizeſt thou then, if thou be not the* Chriſt, *nor* Elias, *&c.*

If

If *John* had been then baptizing of Gentile Proselytes, and had not baptiz'd the natural Jews; the *Pharisees* would not at all have wonder'd to see Converted Gentiles baptized. Tho' the Office of doing even that, was probably not accounted lawful for any but such as had a Commission from the *Sanedrim*; which *John*, we suppose, had not: And therefore they might even in that case have examin'd by what Authority he did it.

But the case here was quite otherwise. The Multitudes whom *John* baptiz'd, were mostly (if not all) natural Jews. And the *Pharisees* and other *Jews* (knowing that their own Nation was not to have any other Baptism than what they had already, till the *Christ* should come, or *Elias* his Forerunner) look'd upon this practice to be in effect the setting himself up for the *Christ*, or at least for *Elias* (as he was indeed that (q) *Elias* [or forerunner] *which was for to come*) and therefore it was that they sent *Priests and Levites from* Jerusalem *to ask him; Who art thou?* And that *all Men mused in their Hearts concerning him, whether he were the Christ or not*, Luke 3. 15.

*Ainsworth*, *Lightfoot*, *Hammond*, and every one that has occasion, do shew the easiness of solving this doubt. The first of these, having largely shewn how common and known a custom this Baptism of Proselytes was, adds at the end of it (r), *Hereupon Baptism was nothing strange to the Jews when* John *the Baptist began his Ministry*, Mat. 3. 5, 6. *They made question of his Person that did it: but not of the thing it self*, John 1. 25.

And 'tis plain that their questions put to *John* do naturally import no other. They do not ask him; *What meanest thou?* or, *what wouldst thou signifie to us by this new ceremony of Baptizing?* Nor any question like that. But, *Who art thou?* And when he confessed, *John* 1. 20. *I am not the Christ.* They say, *What then? Art thou* Elias? &c. and when he said, *I am not*: (meaning that he was not *Elias* in that proper sense that they dreamt of: For they expected that very same Person that had been carried to Heaven) they ask'd farther: *Who art thou? What say'st thou of thy self? Why baptizest thou then* (meaning, the Nation of the Jews) *if thou be not the* Christ, *nor* Elias? *&c.* All

(q) Mat. 11, 14. (r) On Gen. 17. 12.

All this has nothing in it to evince the contrary but that the Jews themſelves did uſe before to baptize ſuch Heathens as came over to them. And indeed ſuch a pompous recital of Arguments that have been long ago commonly anſwer'd, may ſerve to amaze ſuch as have not read the anſwers: but it is not fair nor ingenious dealing for any Learned Men to uſe 'em for that purpoſe. It brings on the World that great inconvenience of being forc'd in Books to ſay *Pro* and *Contra* the ſame things over and over again.

---

ERRATA.

## *ERRATA.*

PAge 1. Vol. 1. *read* Part. 1. *lin. penult. l.* Ch. 14. *v.* 4. *p.* 3. *l.* 27. *l.* aliter. *l. ult. l.* vivi. *p.* 4. *l.* 14. Why did, *l.* Why, said I, did. *p.* 7. *l.* 29. 9th year, *l.* 3d year. *p.* 12. *in the Margin.* Vol. 1. *l.* Pt. 2. *p.* 13. *l.* 10. *l.* ταύτην *l.* 13. *l.* ἐγιγένετο. *p.* 14. *l.* 9. 9, 10. 2. *l.* q. 102. *p.* 15. *l.* 1. *l.* καλὰ μίξιν. *l.* 33. all *l.* ill. *p.* 18. *in the Margin* CH. 2. §. 4. *l.* Introduct. §. 6. *p.* 30. *l.* 26. describes *l.* dislikes. *p.* 37. *in the Margin* peroratio. *l.* præfat. *p.* 43. *l.* 10. *l.* ἐσάζεται· *p.* 76. *l.* 13. *l.* ἐφὴν. *p.* 77. *l. ult. l.* ἀπλυσίαν· *p.* 79. *l.* 28. *l.* χρεῖττον· *l.* 31. *l.* φλιῶν· *p.* 89. *l.* 34. were *l.* where. *p.* 90. *l.* 29. translate it, *l.* translate, *IT.* *p.* 111. *l.* 26. them, *l.* then. *p.* 129. *l. antepenult.* qui, *l.* quia. *p.* 135. *l.* 26. *l.* quidam. *p.* 138. *l.* 18. *l.* futuris. *l.* 39. diligentissimus. *l.* 41. *l.* quisquis. *p.* 139. *l.* 5. & ab, *dele* &. *p.* 152. *l.* 39. stood, so it, *l.* stood so, it. *p.* 163. *l.* 26. lived, *l.* live. *p.* 165. *l.* 11. effects, *l.* affects. *p.* 174. *in the Marg.* blot out those words, *& lib.* 6. *capit. Car. Magni.* *p.* 189. *l.* 32. Grace, *l.* the Grace. *p.* 191. *l. ult.* their, *l.* the. *p.* 193. *l.* 8. *l.* Easter-Eve. *p.* 195. *in the Margin.* incerta, *l.* inserta. *p.* 196. *l.* 30. looked, *l.* had looked. *p.* 200. *in the Margin* 116). *l.* (16) *p.* 204. *l.* 15. *l.* were not moved. *p.* 206. *l.* 17. shall, *l.* should. *p.* 212. *l.* 38. else by his, *l.* else his. *p.* 219. *l.* 17. Grace, *l.* the Grace. *p.* 220. *l.* 11. clean, *l.* unclean. *p.* 225. *l.* 32. what but, *l.* but what. *p.* 231. *l. penult.* heretical Doctrine, *l.* Heretic a Doctrine. *p.* 249. *l.* 8. Demetrias. *l.* 35. not a made. *p.* 261. *l.* 18. Opinions. *p.* 284. *l.* 36. How it could consist. *p.* 291. *l.* 35. published in Mauritania. *p.* 304. *l.* 24. Articles of Faith. *p.* 307. *l.* 33, & 34. Roman, *l.* Prædestinarian. *p.* 313. *l.* 34. does seem. *p.* 315. *l.* 38. who, *l.* which.

THE

# THE HISTORY OF Infant BAPTISM.

## VOL. I.

## CHAP. I.

### *Quotations out of* Clemens Romanus *and* Hermas.

*Clemens Romanus* Epist. 1. ad *Corinthios*, cap. 17.

§. 1. ΕΤΙ δὲ καὶ περὶ Ἰὼβ οὕτω γέγραπται. Ἰὼβ ἦν δίκαιος καὶ ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινὸς, θεοσεβὴς, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. Ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν καταγορῶν λέγει· Οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, οὐδὲ εἰ μιᾶς ἡμέρας ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ.

*In the Apostle's time.*

*Again* of Job *it is thus written, That* he was just and blameless, true, one that feared God, and eschewed Evil. *Yet he condemns himself, and says,* There is none free from Pollution: no, not tho' his Life be but of the length of one Day.

These words of *Job* are quoted from *ch.* 14. *and* 4. where the *English* translation is; *Who can bring a clean*

In the Apostles time.

*thing out of an unclean? not one.* But in the *Greek* translation made by the *Septuagint*, which was in use in the times of our Saviour and the Apostles, they are as *Clement* here renders 'em: and they are accordingly so read by all the primitive Christians. And you will see in the following Quotations, that they often from thence conclude the Necessity of Baptism for the Forgiveness of Sins, even of a Child that is but a Day old. And in the next Chapter, he brings in, to the same Purpose, the Saying of *David, Psal.* 51. 5.

*Ibid. Cap.* 38.

Ἀναλογισώμεθα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐκ ποίας ὕλης ἐγεννήθημεν, ποῖοι καὶ τίνες εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ τάφου καὶ σκότους. Ὁ ποιήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δημιουργήσας εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον αὐτοῦ, προετοιμάσας τὰς ἐνεργεσίας αὐτοῦ πρὸν ἡμᾶς γεννηθῆναι.

*Let us consider therefore, Brethren, whereof we were made: who and what kind of Persons we came into this World: as if it were out of a Sepulchre, and from utter Darkness. He that made and formed us, brought us into his own World, having prepared for us his Benefits before we were born.*

That which I produce these places for, is to shew what the Doctrine of this Apostolical Man was concerning the Pollution and Guilt with which Infants are born into this World.

## *Hermas Pastor l.* 1. *visione* 3. *cap.* 3.

§. 2. He having there describ'd an Emblem or Vision, shewed him by a Woman who represented the Church, concerning a certain *Tower* built on the *Water*, by which the building of Christ's Church was signified: has these Words;

*Interrogavi illam: Quare turris ædificata est super aquam, Domina? Dixeram tibi & prius te versutum esse, circa structuram diligenter inquirentem: igitur invenies veritatem. Quare igitur super aquas ædificatur turris, audi? Quoniam vita vestra per aquam salva facta est, & fiet.*

I ask'd her, Why is the Tower built on the Water? She answer'd, I said before that you were wise to inquire diligently concerning the Building: therefore you shall know the Truth. Hear therefore why the Tower is built on the Waters. Because your Life is saved, and shall be saved by Water.

By

By this is denoted, that Baptism with Water is appointed the Sacrament of Salvation to such as are saved: which meaning will more plainly appear by the Import of the Passage following. In the Apostles time.

## *Hermas Pastor l. 3. Similitud. 9. cap. 16.*

He is there relating a Vision of the same Import as the other; the building of the Church represented by the building of a Tower, wherein all things are shew'd and explain'd to him by an Angel. He sees some Stones put into this Building that were drawn up from the deep; and others that were taken from the Surface of the Earth: the first denoting Persons already dead; the other, Persons yet alive.

Of those drawn up from the deep, he saw first 10 Stones, which filled one Range of building next the Foundation: then 25 more, then 35 more, then 40 more. And afterward in the Explication of the Vision, he asks the Angel;

*Lapides vero illi, Domine, qui de profundo in structurâ aptati sunt, qui sunt? Decem, inquit, qui in fundamentis collocati sunt, primum seculum est: Sequentes viginti quinq; secundum seculum est justorum virorum. Illi autem triginta quinq; Prophetæ Domini ac Ministri sunt. Quadraginta vero, Apostoli & Doctores sunt prædicationis Filij Dei. Quare, inquam, de profundo hi lapides ascenderunt, & positi sunt in structuram turris Tujus, cum jampridem portaverint Spiritus justos? Necesse est, inquit, ut per aquam habeant ascendere, ut requiescant: non poterant enim alitur in regnum Dei intrare, quam ut deponerent mortalitatem prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filij Dei signati sunt, & intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filij Dei, morti destinatus est: at ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur à morte & traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum* aqua *est, in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. Et illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum, & usi sunt eo ut intrarent in regnum Dei.*

*Et dixi; Quare ergo, Domine, illi quadraginta lapides ascenderunt cum illis de profundo, jam habentes illud sigillum? & dixit, Quoniam hi Apostoli & Doctores qui prædicaverunt nomen Filij Dei, cum habentes fidem ejus & Potestatem defuncti essent, prædicaverunt his qui ante obierunt: & ipsi eis dederunt illud signum. Descenderunt igitur in aquam cum illis, & iterum ascenderunt. Sed hi viri descenderunt:*

In the Apostles time.

*at illi qui fuerunt ante defuncti mortui quidem descenderunt, sed vivi ascenderunt. Per hos igitur vitam receperunt & cognoverunt Filium Dei: ideoq; ascenderunt cum eis, & convenerunt in structuram turris. Nec circumcisi, sed integri ædificati sunt, quoniam æquitate pleni cum summâ castitate defuncti sunt: sed tantummodo hoc sigillum defuerat eis. Habes horum Explanationem.*

But, Sir, What are those Stones that were taken out of the deep and fitted into the Building?

The Ten, said he, which were laid in the Foundation, are the first Age: the next 25, the second Age, of righteous Men. The next 35 are the Prophets and Ministers of the Lord: and the 40 are the Apostles and Teachers of the Preaching of the Son of God. Why did these Stones come up out of the deep to be placed in the building of this Tower, since they had the just Spirits before? [viz. *of Justice, Temperance, Chastity,* &c. *which he had mentioned before.*]

It was necessary, said he, for them to come up by [*or thro*] *Water*, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the Kingdom of God, than by putting off the Mortality of their former Life: They therefore, after they were dead, were sealed with the Seal of the Son of God, and so enter'd into the Kingdom of God. For before any one receives the Name of the Son of God, he is liable to Death: But when he receives that Seal, he is deliver'd from Death, and is assigned to Life. Now that Seal is *Water*, into which Persons go down liable to Death, but come up out of it assigned to Life. For which reason to these also was this Seal preached; and they made use of it that they might enter into the Kingdom of God.

And I said, Why then, Sir, did those 40 Stones which had already that Seal, come up with 'em out of the deep?

He answer'd, Because these Apostles and Teachers that preached the Name of the Son of God, dying after they had received his Faith and Power, preached to them that were dead before, and gave to 'em this Seal. For that reason they went down into the Water with 'em, and came up again. But these last were alive before they went down: but they that died formerly, went down dead, but came up again alive. So that it was by the means of these, that they received Life, and knew the Son of God: and accordingly they came up with them,

and

and fitted in the building of the Tower. And they were not hewed, but put in whole, because they died in great Purity, being full of Righteousness: Only this Seal was wanting to 'em. So you have the Meaning of these things.

In the Apostles time.

§. 3. When he says, that *the Seal of the Son of God is necessary for their entring into the Kingdom of God*; and that *that Seal is Water*, it is plainly an Expression of that Sentence or Definition of our Saviour, which St. *John* did *afterward* put into writing in these Words, (1) *Except a Man* (so 'tis in the *English*, but the Original is, ἐὰν μὴ τὶς, *except one*, or *except any Person*) *be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*

(1) John 3. 5.

I say, *afterward*; because this Book was written before St. *John* wrote his Gospel, as I shall shew. And tho' *Hermas* here speak of the Apostles indefinitely, as being dead, it is to be understood of the major part of 'em: for St. *John* was not dead.

§. 4. The Passage it self, which represents the Patriarchs and Prophets of the Old Testament to stand in need of Baptism, and of the Apostles preaching the Name of Christ to 'em after they were dead, before they could be capable of entring the Kingdom of God, does indeed seem strange to us, and is the oddest Passage in all the Book. But we must consider it is represented by way of Vision, where every thing is not to be taken in a proper Sense: Yet *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who liv'd about 100 Year after this Book was written, (2) cites this Passage, and takes it for real matter of fact. And those Texts, 1 *Pet.* 3. 19. & 4. 6. which speak of *the Gospel being preached to them that were dead*, tho' they be now by most Protestants understood in another sense, were by most of the (3) Ancients understood in a Sense like to this.

(2) Strom. 6.

(3) Iren. l. 5. c. 31. Clem. Alex. Strom. 6. Origen c. Cels. l. 2. Tertul. de Anima c. 7.

This Passage does also lead one to think anew of St. *Paul*'s mentioning a Practice of some Men in those times being (4) *baptized for the dead.* A thing that has never yet been agreed on in what sense it is to be understood. Of the Explications that are, I give some account (5) hereafter.

(4) 1 Cor. 15. 29.

(5) Ch. xxi. §. 3.

There is, if we compare this Passage with those Sayings of the Apostles, something like, and something unlike. St. *Peter* mentioning *the Gospel preached to the dead*, (if he be so to be understood) makes it to be done by *Jesus Christ* himself in or by *the Spirit*: which *Hermas* represents

In the Apostles time.

(6) loc. citat.

(7) Hom. in Luc. 14.

ſents as done by the Apoſtles after they were dead; and (6) *Clemens Alex.* by both. St. *Paul* ſpeaks of ſome Perſons baptized for the dead; but *Hermas* in the way of Viſion repreſents the dead themſelves that died under the old Teſtament, to be baptized in the Name of Chriſt. And (7) *Origen* ſpeaks much to the ſame purpoſe as *Hermas*.

But whether theſe were true Viſions, or only the Authors Senſe given under ſuch a Repreſentation, ſtill the Scope of the place is to repreſent the Neceſſity of Water-Baptiſm to Salvation, or to Entrance into the Kingdom of God, in the Opinion of the then Chriſtians, *i. e.* the Chriſtians of the Apoſtles times. Since even they that were dead before the Inſtitution of Baptiſm in the Name of Chriſt, are in way of Viſion repreſented as uncapable of the Kingdom of God without it.

## *Hermas Paſtor l. 3. ſimil. 9. c. 29.*

§. 5. He having there ſpoken of Martyrs, Confeſſors, and ſome other degrees of Chriſtians, comes to ſpeak of a ſort of Harmleſs People, repreſented there by the white colour, who have always been as little Children: and adds theſe Words.

*Quicunq; ergo permanſerint ſicut infantes, non habentes malitiam, honoratiores erunt omnibus illis quos jam dixi. Omnes enim Infantes honorati ſunt apud Dominum & primi habentur.*

Whoſoever therefore ſhall continue as Infants, without Malice, ſhall be more honourable than all thoſe of whom I have yet ſpoken. For all Infants are valued by the Lord, and eſteemed the firſt of all.

This being to the ſame effect as our Saviour's embracing Infants, and ſaying, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*, is one of the Reaſons uſed to prove that they are fit to be admitted into the Covenant of God's Grace and Love by Baptiſm. And whereas the Antipædobaptiſts expound our Saviour's Words, not of Children themſelves, but of Men that are of an innocent Temper, like Children: not only that is affirmed here, but it is moreover ſaid of the Infants themſelves, that they are greatly valued and eſteemed of God.

§. 6. Theſe Books of *Clement* and *Hermas*, when after they had in the ignorant Age lain hid and unminded, they came again into the Hands of learned Men, were at firſt queſtioned,

questioned, whether they were the genuine Pieces of those Authors, and the same that (8) *Eusebius* testifies to have been reckon'd by many for Books of Holy Scripture, and to have been read in many Churches accordingly. But after that so many Quotations of 'em, by the Ancients, have been examin'd, and found to be *verbatim*, the same, there is no longer doubt of that matter. They were accounted divinely inspired by some, but rejected from that rank by others. They may therefore very well pass for the two *Apocryphal Books of the New Testament*, as *Tobit*, &c. are of the Old: and so they are reckon'd by (9) *Eusebius*, (10) *Rufinus*, &c. The greater Commendation is due to the Pains of Dr. *Wake*, for putting them and some other of the most ancient Pieces, into the Hands of the *English Reader*: and the more preposterous is the Humour of many, that prefer the reading of modern things before 'em.

*In the Apostles time.*

(8) Eccl. Hist. l. 3. c. 3. & 16.

(9) ibid.

(10) In Symbolum.

I said that these Books were written before St. *John* wrote his Gospel; which may be made appear thus: St. *John* lived to 68 Years after our Saviour's Passion, *viz.* to the Year of Christ 101. as is attested by St. *Hierom*, who says it in (11) two places, and in one of 'em says; *that the Church Histories do most plainly shew it.* And it is certain he cannot be mistaken considerably, because *Irenæus*, who often recounts how greedily he had in his younger Years heard *Polycarp* discourse of St. *John* and his Affairs, and of the Conferences he had had with him, says in (12) several places, *that St.* John *continued to the times of* Trajan: and the Year of Christ 101. is but the *9th* Year of *Trajan*. And it is agreed by all, that he wrote his Gospel but a very little before his Death.

(11) de script. Eccl. & l. 1. contra Jovinian.

(12) l. 2. c. 39. & l. 3. c. 3.

'Tis true indeed, that St. *John* seems, *chap.* 5. 2. to speak of *Jerusalem* as if it were then standing. But many learned Men understand these Words, *There is at* Jerusalem, *&c.* that is, *in the place where* Jerusalem *was*, or in the Ruines, as if one had said, during the Ruines of *London*, there is in *Cheapside* a Conduit.

The Current Tradition is, that he wrote it upon his Return to *Ephesus*, after that violent Persecution of Christians in the 14*th* Year of *Domitian*, *Anno Dom.* 94, remembred by all Writers. In that Persecution St. *John* was banish'd into the Island *Patmos*, (13) *for the Word of God, and for the Testimony of* Jesus *Christ*: where he had that Vision or *Revelation* which he has publish'd, which *Irenæus* shews to have been in the latter end of *Domitian's*

(13) Rev. 1. 9.

In the Apostles time.

Reign, in these Words, (14) *We will not run the Hazzard of affirming any thing positively, concerning the Name of Antichrist* [signified by the Number 666] *for if it had been expedient to be published plainly at present, it would have been exprest by him himself that saw the Vision: since it is not very long ago that it was seen; being but a little before our time, at the latter end of* Domitian's *Reign.*

(14) l. 5. c. 30.

*Domitian* dying, *anno* 96. and *Nerva* a mild Prince succeeding, the Prisoners and banished Men were released: and St. *John* returned to *Ephesus*, where, as (15) *Irenæus* and (16) *Athanasius* testifie, he wrote his Gospel. And St. *Hierom* mentions the Occasion of it; (17) *He, last of all the rest, wrote his Gospel, being entreated so to do by the Bishops of* Asia, *against* Cerinthus *and other Hereticks, and especially the then new-sprung-up Opinion of the* Ebionites, *who affirm, That Christ had no being before* Mary, *for which reason he thought it needful to discourse concerning his* Divine *Nativity also.* And this is, as to the main, confirmed out of *Irenæus* himself, for he says (18) that *he wrote it at* Ephesus: and, that (19) *he aim'd thereby to extirpate the Error which had been sowed in the Minds of Men by* Cerinthus. These things are reported by such Men as had the Opportunity of easily knowing the Truth in such matters of Fact.

(15) l. 3. c. 1.
(16) in Synopsi.
(17) de script. Eccl. p. Joan.
(18) l. 3. c. 1.
(19) l. 3. c. 11.

Now for the Age of these Books of *Clement* and *Hermas*, one need only enquire for the time of *Clement's* Death: for *Hermas* wrote his while *Clement* was living and Bishop of the Church at *Rome*, and (20) and mentions him therein as such. And tho' the time of *Clement's* Death be not so exactly to be discover'd from the Ancients, but that they that have gone about to settle it have varied; and some from others 20 Years: yet they that have plac'd it the latest have placed it as soon as St. *John's* Death is placed by those that have placed that the soonest, *viz. anno* 101. for in giving that date of St. *John's* Death, I gave the earliest that is pitch'd upon. St. *Chrysostom* and the *Chronicon Alexandr.* make him live some Years longer.

(20) l. 1. vis. 2.

The two that of late have made the most exact Disquisition about the time of St. *Clement*, are Bp. *Pearson* and Mr. *Dodwel.* (21) Bp. *Pearson* having found by undeniable Proofs that the times of *Hyginus* Bp. of *Rome* are set too low in the Chronological Tables by 15 or 20, or (as some Writers place him) 30 Years, and that he must have enter'd upon his Office *anno* 122 at the latest, does proportionably set all the foregoing Bishops higher: and

(21) Pearsoni opera posthuma Chronolog. Dissert. 2.

and so he has made St. *Clement* come into the Bishoprick immediately after the Death of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, which he places, *anno* 68: (35 Years after our Saviour's Passion) and to continue alive till the Year 83. And he supposes *Linus* and *Anencletus*, who are commonly placed before St. *Clement*, to have been no otherwise Bishops there than as they acted under the said Apostles in their Life time.

In the Apostles time.

(22) Mr. *Dodwell* judges that after the said Apostle's Death, which he places, *anno* 64 *Linus* was Bishop, and after him *Anencletus*. But that they both died in a very short time, about a Year, and that *Clement* succeeded *anno* 65, and continued to 81. By either of these Accounts, *Clement* was dead a great while before St. *John* had wrote any of his Books.

(22) Dissertatio sing. de Success. Rom. Pont. c. 11, 12, &c.

But there is a Passage in *Irenæus* (whose Authority every one owns to be in this matter beyond compare) wherein the time of *Clement's* Succession, and the distance thereof from the time of those Apostles is purposely insisted on: and that, tho' it mention not the Years; yet as it supposes his Entry on that Office to be nigher St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*'s time, than some had placed it; so it will by no means suffer him to be placed so early, as to succeed within a year or two after their Death. It is *l.* 3. *c.* 3. where he is confuting that Plea of the *Valentinians*, (Hereticks that held that there is another God, superiour to him that created the World) whereby they pretended to have this Doctrine by Tradition from the Apostles; who would not write it, not tell it to every Body, but to some more perfect Disciples, by whose Hands it came to them. The Words are these.

*It is easie for any one that would be guided by Truth, to know the Tradition of the Apostles, declared in all the World. And we are able to reckon up those that were placed Bishops by the Apostles in the several Churches, and their Successors to this time; who never taught nor knew any such thing as these Men dream of. And the Apostles, if they had known of any deep Mysteries which they would communicate to those that were perfect privately and by themselves; they would have taught 'em to those Men sooner than any to whom they committed the Churches: For they desired that such should be very perfect in every thing, and wanting in nothing, whom they left as their Successors, delivering to them their own place of Government. Since if these Men did well, there*

*would*

In the Apostles time.

*would ensue great Advantage; but if they miscarried, great Mischief.*

*But it being a long Business in such a Book as this to reckon up the Successions of* all *the Churches: if we shew the Tradition left by the Apostles, and the Faith taught the Christians derived by Successions of Bishops to our time, in that Church which is one of the greatest and most ancient, and known to every Body, founded and built by the two most glorious Apostles,* Peter *and* Paul; *we shall shame all those who by Self-conceit or Vain-glory, or by Ignorance, and mistaken Opinion, hold things that they ought not. For every Church, I mean the Christians of all places round about, have necessary Occasions to come to this Church, by reason that the Government and Power is there:* [meaning the Seat of the Empire] *and so in this Church the Tradition of the Apostles is always preserved by means of those that from all places resort thither.*

*The blessed Apostles then having founded and built this Church, deliver'd over to* Linus *the Office of the Bishoprick. This* Linus Paul *mentions in his* (23) *Epistles to* Timothy.

(23) 2 Tim. 4. 21.

*The next to him is* Anencletus.

*After him, in the third place from the Apostles,* Clement *comes into the Bishoprick, who had both seen the blessed Apostles and conferred with them, and had the Preaching, and Tradition of the Apostles as yet sounding in his Ears; and that not he alone, for there were many then left alive who had been personally taught by the Apostles. It was under this* Clement *that a great Dissension happening among the Brethren that were at* Corinth, *the Church that was at* Rome *sent a most powerful Epistle to the* Corinthians, *perswading 'em to Peace, stirring up their Faith a-new, and declaring to them the Traditions which they had lately received from the Apostles: which teaches, that there is but one God Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, Creator of Man,* &c. —— *And that the same God is declared by the Churches to be the Father of our Lord* Jesus Christ, *whoso will may see,* ex ipsâ Scripturâ, *by that Scripture* [or Writing] *it self, and may understand the Apostolical Tradition of the Church: For that Epistle is older than they are that now teach these false Doctrines, and invent another God above the Creator and Maker of the things that are seen.* He proceeds to name the Bishops from *Clement* to *Eleutherius*, who was then Bishop, the 12*th* from the Apostles: and to appeal to the Church of *Smyrna* which had had *Polycarp*: and to the Church of *Ephesus* which had had St. *John* so

lately

lately living among 'em; and that none of these had taught or pretended to know of any of those secret Traditions that these Men set up. In the Apostles time.

Now when it was for his purpose to shew how near *Clement* and this Epistle of his were to the times of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and he says no more, but that *Clement* had seen and heard them, and that several others were then alive beside him, that had done the like; he plainly supposes that they had been dead a considerable time. For we never speak so of Men that have been dead but a Year or two. When we say, *There are many yet alive that can remember such a Man, and have convers'd with him*, a Stander by will conclude, we speak of one that has been dead a good while: it may be 15 or 20 Years. And yet even so, if we reckon with (24) *Eusebius* and other ancient Accounts, that *Clement* held the Seat but nine Years, he will yet die before St. *John*, and before the time when, by all Accounts, he wrote his Gospel. This also is considerable; that *Clement*, who quotes many places out of other Books of the New-Testament, seems never to have seen any of St. *John's* Writings.

(24) Chronic. it. Hist. l. 3. c. 34.

Therefore tho' Bp. *Pearson* has convinc'd every Body that *Hyginus* is to be placed as he has placed him: yet it seems improbable that *Clement* should have been Bishop so soon as he places him. Rather some Years are to be taken from the times of the Bishops that were between those two.

§. 9. For the same reason, I think it very improbable that this *Clement* was the *Clement* mentioned, *Phil.* 4. 3. as St. *Paul's Fellow-Labourer*, when he was at *Rome* the first time, 6 Years before his Martyrdom: tho' (25) *Eusebius*, St. (26) *Jerom*, and *Epiphanius* do guess him to be the same. For would not *Irenæus* have mention'd that instead of saying what he does? It was much more to his purpose, than to observe the like of *Linus*, of whose Authority he makes no such use.

(25) H. E. l. 3 c. 12.
(26) de Script. Eccl. v. Clemens.

And more improbable it is, that this *Hermas* should be the same whom St. *Paul* salutes as his Acquaintance 11 Years before he died, *Rom.* 16. 14. tho' (27) *Origen* guess it to be he; and (28) *Eusebius* and (29) St. *Jerom* tell us that several thought so. For this *Hermas*, as he was no young Man, because (30) he had Children then guilty of Fornication; so he was no very old Man when he wrote: because he mentions the (31) Woman that had been

(27) Hom. in Rom. 16.
(28) l. 3. c. 3.
(29) de Script. Eccl. Hermas.
(30) l. 1. vis. 2. c. 2.
(31) l. 1. vis. 1.

In the Apostolic time.

been brought up with him, as a Woman of such great Beauty at that time,

I shall have occasion in another (32) place to make the like Observation of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and to shew that probably it is not of that *Barnabas* that is mentioned in the *Acts of the Apostles*. To conclude Men to be the same, because of the same Name, as it is very obvious, so 'tis of little weight.

(32) Vol. I. Chap. 9. §. 6.

And if they be not judged to be the same, nor to have had any such Familiarity with the Apostles, but only to have seen or heard 'em, &c. then that Argument falls to the Ground of those that say, These Books are either spurious, and then why do we regard 'em? or else, if they be counted genuine, why are they not put into the Canon, as well as the Writings of St. *Luke*, and St. *Mark*? St. *Mark* and St. *Luke* were for certain Contemporaries, Companions, and intimate Acquaintance with the Apostles for a long time of their Life: the same is not certain, and I believe not true, of the Authors of these Books; tho' it be plain that they liv'd in the Apostles Age, and wrote before the Death of St. *John*.

---

# CHAP. II.

## Quotations out of *Justin Martyr*.

### *Dialog. cum Tryphone. pag.* 94. *Ed. Steph.* 1551.

Yearafter the Apostles 40.

§. 1. Καὶ ἐχ' ὡς ἐνδεῆ αὐτὸν τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, ἢ τοῦ ἐπελθόντος ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς πνεύματος, οὐδαμῶς αὐτὸν ἐλευθῆναι ὅτι τὸν πόλεμον, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὸ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι ὡς ἐνδεὴς τούτων ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ Ὄφεως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἑκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου.

*And we know that he did not go to Jordan, as having any need of being baptized, or of the Spirits coming on him in Shape of a Dove. As also, neither did he submit to be born and to be crucified, as being under any Necessity of those things. But he did this for Mankind, which by* Adam *was fallen under Death, and under the Guile of the Serpent, beside the particular Cause which each Man had of Sinning.*

I recite

I recite this only to shew, that in these times so very near the Apostles, they spoke of original Sin affecting all Mankind descended of *Adam*: and understood, that besides the actual Sins of each particular Person, there is in our Nature it self, since the Fall, something that needs Redemption and Forgiveness by the Merits of Christ. And that is ordinarily applied to every particular Person by Baptism.

Year after the Apostles, 40.

*Dialog. cum Tryphone. pag. 59. ejusdem Edit.*

§. 2. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ διὰ τούτου προσῳκειωμένοι τῷ Θεῷ, οὐ ταυτὴν τὴν κατὰ σάρκα περιτεμνόμεθα περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν; ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ βαπτίσματος αὐτὴν, ἐπειδὴ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγεγονεῖμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλάβομεν καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφετὸν ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν.

*We also who by him have had Access to God, have not receiv'd this Carnal Circumcision, but the spiritual Circumcision, which* Enoch, *and those like him observed. And we have received it by* Baptism, *by the Mercy of God, because we were Sinners: and it is enjoyned to all Persons to receive it by the same way.*

'Tis plain that this most ancient Father does here speak of Baptism, being to Christians in the stead of Circumcision: and the Analogy between these two is one of the Arguments used by the Pædobaptists to prove that one ought to be given to Infants, as well as the other was. It is to the same Sense, as is that Saying of St. *Paul*, where he calls Baptism, with the putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, which attends it, *the Circumcision of Christ*, (or as it would be more intelligibly render'd, *the Christian Circumcision*) in these (3) Words; *In whom also ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ, buried with him by Baptism.* For by those Words, *the Circumcision of Christ*, must be understood either that Action by which Christ himself in his Infancy was circumcised: and it is no sense to say, that the *Colossians* were circumcised with that: or else, that Circumcision which Christ has appointed, *the Christian Circumcision*: and with that he says they were circumcised, being buried with him by Baptism. Only he, as well as *Justin*, refers both to the inward and outward part of Baptism; whereof the inward part is done without Hands:

(3) Col. 2. 11, 12.

Year after the Apostles 40

Hands: and accordingly the Ancients were wont to call Baptism, περιτομὴν ἀχειροποίητον, *the Circumcision done without Hands*; as will appear by some following Quotations. (a) So that it seems hard for the Antipædobaptists to maintain, as some of them do, that the Scripture and ancient Christians do not make any Resemblance between these two Sacraments.

(a) See Chap. xii. §. 5. chap. xiv. §. 1.

The Paraphrase given of this Text, of St. *Paul* in the *Quest. ad Orthodox.* ascribed to *Justin Martyr* 9, 10. 2. is this. The Question there is, *Why, if Circumcision were a good thing, we do not use it as well as the Jews did?* The Answer is, *We are circumcised by Baptism with Christ's Circumcision*, &c. And he brings this Text for his Proof.

## *Justini Apologia prima (vulgo 2da) ad Antoninum Pium.* (4)

(4) prope finem.

§. 3. This holy Man and good Martyr of *Jesus Christ* does in this Apology presented to the Emperor and Senate, in behalf of the Christians, vindicate them from the absurd and abominable Slanders which the people rais'd on 'em: as that they did in their Assemblies eat young Children, and commit promiscuous Fornication, *&c.* And having spoke of their Doctrine and Conversation, and shewn that they neither believed nor practised any such mischievous things as were reported, he proceeds to speak of the two most solemn Rites that they used, *viz.* of initiating or entring the Converts that came to 'em by Baptism: and of confirming their Faith, by receiving the Lord's-Supper. And of Baptism says thus, Ὃν τρόπον δὲ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐξηγησόμεθα. ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν κοινωνεῖν τι ἀν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. Ὅσοι ἂν πείθωσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα, εἶναι, καὶ βίον ὅτως δύναται ὑπιχνεῖται, εὐχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδασκόμενα, ἡμῶν συνεύχομένων καὶ συνηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. Ἔπειτα ἀγόνται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστί, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγενοῦνται. Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸν ἐν τῷ ὑδατι τότε λουόμενον ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι φανερὸν πᾶσιν ἐστί. Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ Προφήτου, ὡς προεγράφαμεν, εἴρηται, τίνα τρόπον φεύξονται τὰς ἁμαρτίας οἱ ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ μετανοοῦντες, ἐλέχθη δὲ ὅτως, Λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, &c. —— Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον, ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ ἀνάγκην κεκτημένοι ἐξ ὑγρᾶς

σπορᾶς

ποιησᾶς καὶ μίξιν τινὰ τῶν γενέσεων καθ' ἑαυτὰς, καὶ ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ ἀνοήτοις ἀνατεθραμμένα γεγόναμεν, ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μηδὲ ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἀφέσεως τε ἁμαρτιῶν ὧν πεποιήκαμεν τυχόντες ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἐπονομάζεται τοῦ ἑλομένου ἀναγεννηθῆναι καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα, &c. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμός.

Year after the Apostles 40.

*I will now declare to you also after what manner we being made new by Christ* [or baptized] *have dedicated our selves to God: least if I should leave out that, I might seem to deal unfairly in some part of my Apology. They who are perswaded and do believe that those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise to live according to 'em, are directed first to pray and ask of God, with fasting, the Forgiveness of their former Sins: and we also pray and fast together with 'em. Then we bring 'em to some place where there is Water; and they are* regenerated *by the same way of* Regeneration *by which we were* regenerated: *for they are washed with Water in the Name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour* Jesus Christ, *and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ says,* (5) unless you be regenerated, you cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: *and every Body knows it is impossible for those that are once generated* [or born] *to enter again into their Mother's Womb.*

(5) John 3. 35.

*It was foretold by the Prophet* (6) Isaiah, *as I said, by what means they who would repent of their Sins might escape 'em: and was written in these Words;* Wash you, make you clean, put away the Evil, *&c.*

(6) Isa. 1. 16.

*And we have been taught by the Apostles this Word* [or this Reason] *for this thing: because we being ignorant of our first Birth were generated by Necessity* [or Course of Nature] *of the humid Seed of our Parents mixing together, and have been brought up in all Customs and Conversation; that we should not continue Children of that Necessity and Ignorance, but of Will* [or Choice] *and Knowledge, and should obtain Forgiveness of the Sins in which we have lived, by Water,* [or in the Water]. *There is invoked, over him that has a Mind to be* regenerated, *the Name of God, the Father and Lord of all things,* &c.-----*And this washing is called* the enlightning, *&c.*

If I am ask'd to what purpose I bring in this in a Discourse of *Infant-Baptism*: my Answer is, That I do not produce it as making directly or immediately either for or against it. He being here to shew that the Ceremony of

Year after the Apostles 40.

of entring Proselytes that came to them from the *Heathens*, had no ill thing in it, had no Occasion to speak of the case of Infants. But I bring it,

1. Because it is the most ancient Account of the way of baptizing, next the Scripture; and shews the plain and simple manner of administring it: having no mention of Oyl, Chrism, Honey, &c. The Christians of these times had lived, many of them at least, in the Apostles Days.

§. 4. 2. Because it shews that the Christians of these times used the Word *Regeneration*, [or, being born again] for Baptism: and that they were taught so to do by the Apostles. And it will appear by the multitude of places I shall produce, that they us'd it as customarily, and appropriated it as much to signifie Baptism, as we do the Word *Christning*. They us'd also ἀνακαινισμὸς or παιγγενεσία, *Renewing, and* φωτισμὸς, *Enlightning*, for the same thing: as appears by the first and last Words of this Passage:

And 3*dly*, Because we see by it, that they understood that Rule of our Saviour, *Except one be regenerated* [or born again] *of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, of Water-Baptism, and concluded from it, that without such Baptism, no Person could come to Heaven. And so did all the Writers of these 400 Years, not one Man excepted.

§. 5. This is of the more use to note, because many modern Writers use the Word *Regeneration* or *New-Birth*, for Repentance and Conversion, whether it be accompanied with Baptism at that time or not. But the Ancients do not so. The Scripture also uses it for Baptism: *The Washing of Regeneration*, Tit. 3. 5. is the Washing of Baptism.

And I shewed before in the Introduction, that this Phrase was not first used by our Saviour or his Apostles: but that it was a usual Word of the *Jews*, to denote that Baptism by which any Proselyte was baptized unto *Moses*.

## *Justin Martyr Apol.* 1 (*vulgò* 2*da*) *prope ab initio.*

§. 6. Καὶ πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἑξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι. *Several Persons among us of 60 and 70 Years old, of both Sexes, who*

*who were discipled* [or made Disciples] *to Christ in their Childhood, do continue uncorrupted* [or Virgins.] Year after the Apostles 40.

St. *Justin*'s Word, ἐμαθητεύθησαν *were discipled*, or, *made Disciples*, is the very same Word that had been used by St. *Matthew* in expressing our Saviour's Command, μαθητεύσατε, *Disciple* [or, make Disciples] *All the Nations*. And it was done to these Persons, *Justin* says, in their Childhood. So that whereas the Antipædobaptists do say, that when our Saviour bids the Apostles, *Disciple the Nations, baptizing 'em*; he cannot mean Infants; because he must be understood to bid 'em baptize only such among the Nations as could be made Disciples: and Infants, they say, cannot be made Disciples. They may perceive that in the Sense in which *Justin* understood the Word, they may be made Disciples. And *Justin* wrote but 100 Years after St. *Mathew*.

---

## CHAP. III.

### *Quotations out of St.* Irenæus.

§. 1. THis Father does in many places speak of original Sin, as affecting (1) *all Mankind*, (2) *all our Race*, putting 'em in a State of (3) *Debtors to God, Transgressors, and Enemies to him*, (4) *under the Stroak of the Serpent, and addicted to Death*. And that it is only in and thro' Christ that they have (5) *Reconciliation and Redemption*. He also so speaks of Baptism, as of the Means or Instrument by which this Redemption is conveyed and applied to any one, and calls it by the Name of (6) λύτρωσις & ἀπολύτρωσις *Redemption*. Year after the Apostles 67.

(1) l. c. Iræ. 5. c. 19.
(2) ibid. c. 21.
(3) ibid. c. 16.
(4) l. 4. c. 5. & l. 5. c. 19.
(5) l. 3. c. 20.
(6) l. 1. c. 18.

But tho' this laid together do make an Argument for the baptizing all Persons, Infants as well as others; yet I shall pass by this and other such places in this and other Authors, that speak of original Sin, and the Necessity of Baptism only in general: intending henceforward to recite such only as do more directly and immediately concern Infants, and speak of their Baptism, either for or against it.

Year after the Apostles 67.

## *Irenæus adv. Hæreses, l. 2. c. 39.* Speaking of Christ.

§. 2. *Magister ergo existens Magistri quoq; habebat ætatem. Non reprobans nec supergrediens hominem, neq; solvens suam legem in se humani generis: sed omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam quæ ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semet ipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum; infantes, & parvulos, & pueros, & juvenes, & seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem: & infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes: in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem; simul & exemplum illis pietatis effectus, & justitiæ & subjectionis: in juvenibus juvenis,* &c.

'Therefore as he was a Master, he had also the Age of 'a Master. Not disdaining nor going in a way above hu-'mane Nature; nor breaking in his own Person the Law 'which he had set for Mankind: but sanctifying every se-'veral Age by the Likeness that it has to him. For he 'came to save all Persons by himself: *All*, I mean, who 'by him are *regenerated* [*or baptized*] unto God; *Infants*, 'and Little-ones, and Children, and Youths, and Elder 'Persons. Therefore he went thro' the several Ages: for 'Infants being made an Infant, sanctifying Infants: to 'Little-ones he was made a Little-one, sanctifying those 'of that Age; and also giving them an Example of Godli-'ness, Justice and Dutifulness: to Youths he was a Youth, *&c.*

This Testimony, which reckons Infants among those that are *regenerated*, is plain and full; provided the Reader be one that is satisfied that the Word *Regeneration* does, in the usual Phrase of those times, signify *Baptism*: and this cannot be doubted by any that are at all acquainted with the Books of those Ages. As for those that are not, I have already had Occasion to (7) refer 'em to the use of the *Jews* before and in Christ's time, and to some places of Scripture: and it may be worth the while to turn back to the Passage of *Justin Martyr* last quoted, (He lived but 30 or 40 Years before this Man) and to observe how he uses the Word. The Reader will also see in almost all the Passages that I shall have occasion to produce, the same use of the Word constantly observed: that to say *regenerated* is with them as much as to say *baptized*.

(7) CH. 2. §. 4, 5.

As

At Present, take these three Evidences of it. 1. *Irenæus* himself uses it so in all other places of his Book that I have ever observed: as for Instance, *l.* 3. *c.* 19. where he is producing Testimonies of Scripture concerning the Holy Spirit, he has this, *Et iterum, potestatem* regenerationis *in Deum demandans discipulis, dicebat eis,* &c. And again, when he gave his Disciples the Commission of *Regenerating* unto God, he said unto them, *Go and teach all Nations, baptizing 'em in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:* where the *Commission of regenerating* plainly means the *Commission of baptizing.*

Year after the Apostles 67.

See Appendix to his Defence

§. 4. 2. There are several Sayings both of the *Latin* and *Greek* Fathers, which do plainly shew, that they not only used that Word for Baptism, but also that they so appropriated it to Baptism, as to exclude any other Conversion or Repentance that is not accompanied with Baptism, from being signified by it. As these that follow.

*Greg. Nazianzen,* when he deters the baptized Person from falling back into sinful Courses, tells him, (8) *There is no: another* Regeneration *afterward to be had, tho' it be sought with never so much Crying and Tears*; and yet grants in the next Words, that there is Repentance after Baptism: but shews a difference between that, and the free Forgiveness given in Baptism.

(8) Orat. 40, prope ab initio. ἐκ δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως.

St. *Austin* being askt, whether a Parent carrying his Child which had been baptized to the Heathen Sacrifices, do thereby obliterate the Benefit of his Baptism, (9) gives this Rule; *An Infant does never lose the Grace of Christ which he has once receiv'd, but by his own sinful Deeds, if when he grows up he proves so wicked: For then he will begin to have Sins of his own, quæ non regeneratione auferantur, sed alia curatione sanentur.* 'Which are not to 'be done away by Regeneration, but by some other way 'of Cure. These kind of Sayings do plainly contradistinguish Regeneration from Repentance, Conversion, &c. except in the case of Baptism.

(9) Epist. 23. ad Bonifacium.

So St. *Hierom* discoursing in Praise of Virginity, has this (10) among the rest, that *Christ was natus ex Virgine, renatus per Virginem: born of a Virgin, and* regenerated *by a Virgin*: meaning he was baptized by *John* that was unmarried. To say that Christ was *regenerated,* taking the Word, as many modern Writers do, for Conversion, Repentance, &c. would be an impious Speech.

(10) l. 1. contra Jovinian. circa medium.

St. *Austin* calls the Persons by whose means Infants are baptized, *quos per quos renascuntur,* those by whom they are

Year after the Apostles 67.

See Appendix

regenerated, which would be a strange Speech in the Dialect of some late *English* Writers, who use the Word, for the Conversion of the Heart.

§. 5. 3. When *Irenæus* does here speak of *Infants regenerated*; 'tis plain enough of it self, that they are not capable of Regeneration in any other sense of the Word, than as it signifies Baptism: I mean the outward Act of Baptism accompanied with that Grace or Mercy of God, whereby he admits 'em into Covenant, tho' without any Sense of theirs.

I shall in the places that I must cite henceforward where we meet with the Word, *regeneratus, renatus, &c.* translate it *regenerated*, without any farther Explication: but the Reader will find that he must understand by it, *baptiz'd*; or else that he will make no Sense at all of the place.

Since this is the first express Mention that we have met with of Infants baptized, it is worth the while to look back, and consider how near this Man was to the Apostles time. Mr. *Dodwel*, who has with the greatest Care and Skill computed his Age, (10) makes him to be born in the Apostolick Age, *viz.* the Year after Christ's Birth 97, four Years before St. *John* died; and that he was chosen Bishop of *Lyons*, *Anno Dom.* 167. which is after the Apostles 67. His Proofs are too long to repeat here. So much is plain, that he wrote the Book I here quote within 80 years after the Apostles, and that he was then a very old Man. For he wrote the two first of his *five Books* against *Heresies* first, and (11) publish'd them; in which these Words are: and he publish'd his third Book in the time of *Eleutherus* Bishop of *Rome*, for he (12) mentions him as then Bishop. *Eleutherus*'s time is set by (13) Bishop *Pearson* from the Year of Christ 170 to 185: but by (14) Mr. *Dodwel* from 162 to 177. So that the Year of Christ 180 is the latest that the two first Books can well be suppos'd to have been written. Therefore whether we agree or not with Mr. *Dodwel*, that he was born before St. *John's* Death; yet it could be but very little after, by the Age he must be of when he wrote. And besides, he himself (15) says, as I also recited before, that the *Revelation* made to St. *John* in *Patmos* was *but a little before his time*, and that *Revelation* was 5 or 6 Years before St. *John* died. The learned Man that has given the last Edition of his Works, though he differ from Mr. *Dodwel* yet makes him born but 6 Years after St.

(10) Dissert. ad Irenæum.

(11) vide Prolog. l. 3.

(12) c. 3.

(13) Pearsoni opera posthuma.

(14) Dissert. sing. de Rom. Pontif. Successione c. 14. & 15.

(15) l. 5. c. 30.

St. *John's* Death. Every Body that was at this time 80 Year old, must have been born in the Apostles time. *Irenæus's* Parents must have been born then, if he were not himself. Year after the Apostles 67.

I shall say no more, but leave it to every Body to judge whether it were possible for the Church then to be ignorant what was done as to the baptizing of Infants in the Apostles time, when many then living, and the Parents of most then living were themselves Infants in that time. Yet this I may add, that *Irenæus*, tho' at this time he liv'd in *France*, being Bishop of *Lyons*, yet was brought up in *Asia*, (where St. *John* had died but a little before) and probably born of Christian Parents. For he had in his younger Years often heard *Polycarp* (who was St. *John's* Acquaintance, and was (16) chosen by him Bishop of *Smyrna*, and was probably that *Angel* [or Bishop] *of the Church of Smyrna*, that is so much commended, *Rev.* 2. 8.) discourse of St. *John* and his teaching. This he relates of himself in his (17) *Epistle to Florinus*: and he says, he remembers the thing as if it were but yesterday: for says he, *I remember the things that were done then, better than I do those of later times* (which is the Property of old Men) *so that I could describe the place where he sate, and his going out and coming in, his manner of Life, his Features, his Discourse to the People concerning the Conversation he had had with* John, *and others that had seen our Lord, how he rehears'd their Discourses, and what he had heard them that were Eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, say of our Lord, and of his Miracles and Doctrine: all agreeable to the Scriptures.*

(16) Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

(17) Apud Euseb. Hist. l. 5. c. 19.

In an Age so nigh the Apostles, and in a place where one of 'em had so lately liv'd, the Christians could not be ignorant what had been done in their time in a Matter so publick and notorious as is the baptizing or not baptizing of Infants.

It is to be noted, that this Testimony of *Irenæus*, or any other of any of the Fathers, is not so much to be regarded as it speaks their Opinion or Sense, as it is for that it gives us an Evidence of what was then believ'd, taught, or practis'd by the Church. If he had only signified that he thought fit that Infants should be regenerated, it had been but one Doctor's Opinion: but he speaks of it as a thing generally known that they were then usually regenerated. Appendix.

# CHAP. IV.

## Out of *Tertullian.*

Year after the Apostles 100

§. 1. *Tertullian* and *Origen* being the two next that have said any thing of this Matter, their Character is such as requires something to be said of it. They were both of 'em very learned Men; but both inclin'd to be singular in their Opinions, and accordingly both fell into great and monstrous Errors in the Faith.

The first fell into the Heresie of the *Montanists*, who blasphemously held that one *Montanus* was that *Paraclete* or *Comforter* which our Saviour promised to send: and that better and fuller Discoveries of God's Will were made to him than to the Apostles, who prophesied only in part. He commonly calls the *Catholicks*, *Psychichos the carnal Men.* And he afterward forsook the *Montanists* too, and set up a new Sect of his own called (1) *Tertullianists*: some Remainders of which Sect continued at *Carthage* till St. *Austin's* time, and he had the Happiness to convert the last of 'em, and to get 'em to give up their Church or place of Worship to the Catholicks.

(1) Augustin. de hæresibus. c. 26. & 86.

The other being a great *Platonist*, taught the Præexistence of Souls: that the Souls of all Men had a former Being before the World, and had sinned in that former State, and were sent hither into Bodies as a Punishment: and he (2) derived original Sin from thence, which the Scripture derives from the Fall of *Adam.* He had also other Errors about the Resurrection and the future State, *&c.* So that (3) St. *Hierom* giving Advice to *Tranquilinus* of the Caution wherewith one must read *Origen's* Works, says, *My Opinion is that* Origen *is sometimes to be read because of his Learning, but so as we read* Tertullian, Arnobius, Apollinaris, *and some other Ecclesiastical Writers, both* Greek *and* Latin, *taking care to choose the good that is in 'em and avoid the contrary.*

(2) Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 11. c. 23.

(3) Ep. ad Tranquilinum 76.

As for the Occasion I have here to quote 'em, the Rule I mention'd before is chiefly to be minded; that so far as they do, as Historians, give us an Account of the Faith and Practise of the Church in their times, their Testimony is considerable: but where either of 'em has any particular

cular Opinion of his own, it is not of any great Authority.

Year after the Apostles 100

*Tertullian* has spoke so in this Matter of Infant-Baptism, as that it is hard to reconcile the several Passages with one another. The Reader shall have the Particulars.

## *Tertullianus de Baptismo, c.* 10.

§. 2. Having spoken of the Matter of Baptism, Water, and the Form of it, *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, he adds,

*Diximus quantum mediocritati nostræ licuit de universis quæ baptismi religionem struunt: nunc ad reliquum statum ejus æque ut potero progrediar de quæstiunculis quibusdam.*

'I have according to my mean Ability discours'd of all 'things that make up the Religion [*or Essence*] of Bap-'tism: Now I will proceed to speak of some lesser Que-'stions about the other State thereof.

*Afterward* c. 12, 13.

§. 3. *Quum vero præscribitur nemini sine baptismo competere salutem, ex illâ maximè pronunciatione Domini, qui ait; nisi natus ex aquâ quis erit, non habet salutem: suboriuntur scrupuli, imò temerarii tractatus quorundam, quomodo ex istâ præscriptione Apostolis salus competat, quos tinctos non invenimus in Domino, præter Paulum: imò cum Paulus solus ex illis baptismum Christi induerit, aut præjudicatum esse de cæterorum periculo, qui careant aquâ Christi, ut præscriptio salva sit: aut rescindi præscriptionem, si etiam non tinctis salus statuta est. Audivi (Domino Teste) ejusmodi: ne quis me tam perditum existimet, ut ultro exagitem libidine Styli quæ aliis scrupulum incutiant. Et nunc illis, ut potero, respondebo qui negant Apostolos tinctos. Nam si humanum Johannis baptismum inierant & Dominicum desiderabant (quatenus unum baptismum definierat ipse Dominus, dicens Petro perfundi volenti; qui semel lavit non habet necesse rursum: quod utiq; non tincto omninò non dixisset) & hæc est probatio exerta adversus illos qui adimunt Apostolis etiam Johannis baptismum, ut destruant aquæ sacramentum. ——— paulo post ——— Hic ergo scelestissimi illi provocant quæstiones: Adeo dicunt, baptismus necessarius*

Year after the Apostles 100.

*non est, quibus fides satis est: nam & Abraham nullius aquæ nisi fidei Sacramento Deo placuit.*

*Sed in omnibus posteriora concludunt, & sequentia antecedentibus prævalent. Fuerit salus retro per fidem nudam ante Domini passionem, & resurrectionem: at ubi fides aucta est credendi in nativitatem, passionem, resurrectionemq; ejus addita est ampliatio sacramento, obsignatio baptismi, vestimentum quodammodo fidei, quæ retro erat nuda, nec potest jam [esse] sine suâ lege. Lex enim tinguendi imposita est & forma præscripta; Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tinguentes eas in nomen Patris & Filij & Spiritûs Sancti. Huic legi collata definitio illa, nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ & Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum cœlorum; obstrinxit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem. Itaq; omnes exinde credentes tinguebantur, &c.*

'Whereas it is an acknowledged Rule, that none can 'be saved without Baptism: grounded especially on that 'Sentence of our Lord; *Unless one be born of Water, he 'has no Life:* Some Scruples do arise, and even rash Dis'courses of some Men; How according to that Rule the 'Apostles could be saved, whom we do not find to have 'been baptized with our Lord's Baptism, except *Paul.* 'And when *Paul* only of them had the Baptism of Christ, 'either the rest who wanted this Water of Christ must be 'suppos'd in a dangerous Condition, that so the *Rule* may 'stand fast: or else *the Rule* is broken if any Persons not 'baptized can be saved. I have heard some Men (God 'is my Witness) talk at this rate, and would have no Body 'think me so lewd as by the itch of my Pen to raise Que'stions purposely, which may cause Scruples in other Men. 'I will here give an Answer, as well as I can; to those 'Men that deny the Apostles to have been baptiz'd. For 'if they received only the Baptism of *John* as of a Man, 'and had not that of our Lord: Inasmuch as our Lord 'himself appointed one Baptism, saying to *Peter* when he 'desired to be washed; *He that has been once washed, has 'no need again:* which he would not have said to one that 'had not been wash'd at all: even this is a plain proof a'gainst those who take away from the Apostles even the 'Baptism of *John*, that they may abolish as needless the 'Sacrament of Water. —— And a little after —— Here 'again these impious Men raise Cavils, and say; *Baptism 'is not necessary for those that have Faith, which is sufficient: 'for* Abraham *without any Sacrament of Water, but of Faith 'only, pleased God.*

'But

'But in all Matters the later Injunctions bind, and the following Rules take place above those that were before. Tho' there were Salvation formerly by bare Faith before our Lord's Passion and Resurrection; yet when the Faith is enlarged to believe in his Nativity, Passion and Resurrection, there is an Enlargement of the Sacrament, the sealing of Baptism, as it were a Garment to our Faith; which formerly was bare, but cannot now be without its Law, for the Law of baptizing is given, and the Form of it appointed; *Go*, says he, *teach the Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* And when to this Law that *Rule* is added, *Except one be regenerated of Water and the Spirit, he shall not see the Kingdom of Heaven*, it has bound up Faith to a Necessity of Baptism. And therefore all Believers from thence forward were baptized, &c.

Year after the Apostles 100.

*And afterward* c. 17.

§. 4. Having said that it is not absolutely unlawful for Laymen to baptize, he adds,

*Sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ & modestiæ incumbit, cum ea majoribus competant, ne sibi adsumant dicatum episcopis officium episcopatûs? Æmulatio schismatum mater est. Omnia licere dixit sanctissimus Apostolus, sed non omnia expedire. Sufficiat scilicet in necessitatibus utaris, sicubi aut loci aut Temporis aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur cum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditi hominis, si supersederit præstare quod liberè potuit.*

'But how much more necessary for Laymen is it to keep the Rules of Humility and Modesty, that since these things belong to Men of higher Order, they do not arrogate to themselves the Office of the Bishops that is proper to them? Emulation is the Mother of Schism. The most blessed Apostle said, that all things were lawful, but all things were not expedient. Let it suffice that thou make use of this Power in Cases of Necessity: when the Circumstance either of the Place, or of the Time, or of the Person requires it. For then the adventuring to help is well taken, when the Condition of a Person in Danger forces one to it: because he that shall neglect at such a time to do what he lawfully may, will be guilty of the Persons Perdition [*or Damnation.*]

Let

Year after the Apostles, 100.

Let the Reader mind how all this is to be reconcil'd with what he says afterward *c.* 18.

§. 5. *Cæterum baptismum non temerè credendum esse sciant quorum officium est. Omni petenti te dato, suum habet titulum, proinde ad eleemosynam pertinentem. Imò illud potius perspiciendum; nolite dare sanctum canibus, & porcis projicere margarita vestra: &, manus ne facilè imposueris, ne participes aliena delicta.* ——— *Itaq; pro cujusq; personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est: præcipuè tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est* [ ] *sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia & ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, & proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus, Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur: fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agetur in secularibus; ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, Divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, ut petenti dedisse videaris. Non minori de causâ innupti quoq; procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata est; tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant aut continentiæ corroborentur. Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilationem. Fides integra secura est de salute.*

*Diem baptismo solenniorem Pascha præstat; cum & passio Domini in quam tingimur, adimpleta est*, &c.

'But they whose Duty it is to administer Baptism, are 'to know, that it must not be given rashly. *Give to every 'one that asketh thee*, has its proper Subject, and relates 'to Almsgiving: But that Command rather is here to be 'consider'd; *Give not that which is holy to Dogs, neither cast 'your Pearls before Swine.* And that, *lay hands suddenly on 'no Man, neither be Partaker of other Mens Faults.* ——— 'Therefore according to every ones Condition and Dis-'position, and also their Age, the delaying of Baptism is 'more profitable, especially in the case of Little-Children. 'For what need is there [ ] that the 'Godfathers should be brought into Danger? because 'they may either fail of their Promises by Death, or they 'may be mistaken by a Child's proving of wicked Dispo-'sition. Our Lord says indeed, *Do not forbid 'em to come 'to me.* Therefore let 'em come when they are grown up: 'let

'let 'em come when they understand: when they are instru- 'cted whither it is that they come: let 'em be made 'Christians when they can know Christ. What need their 'guiltless Age make such hast to the Forgiveness of Sins? 'Men will proceed more warily in worldly things: and he 'that should not have earthly Goods committed to him, 'yet shall have heavenly. Let them know how to desire 'this Salvation, that you may appear to have given to one 'that asketh.

Year after the Apostles 100.

'For no less reason unmarried Persons ought to be 'kept off, who are likely to come into Tentation, as well 'those that never were married, upon account of their 'coming to Ripeness, as those in Widowhood, for the miss 'of their Partner; until they either marry or be confirm'd in Continence. They that understand the weight of 'Baptism will rather dread the receiving it than the de- 'laying of it.

'The most solemn time for Baptism is *Easter*, at which 'time the Passion of our Lord, into which we are baptized, 'was fulfilled, *&c.*

Let there be also compar'd with this, what he says in another Book.

## *Tertullianus de Animâ*, c. 39, 40.

§. 6. *Adeonulla fere nativitas munda est, utiq; Ethnicorum. Hinc enim & Apostolus ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait: tam ex seminis prærogativâ quam ex institutionis disciplinâ: cæterùm, inquit, immundi nascerentur. Quasi designatos tamen sanctitati, ac per hoc etiam saluti intelligi volens fidelium filios: ut hujus spei pignore matrimonijs quæ retinenda censuerat patrocinaretur. Alioquin meminerat Dominicæ definitionis; nisi quis nascetur ex aquâ & spiritu, non ibit in regnum Dei, i. e, non erit sanctus. Ita omnis anima cousq; in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur & tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur: peccatrix autem quia immunda.*

So there is almost no being born clean [*or free from Sin*] that is of Heathens. For hence the Apostle says, that, *of either Parent sanctified the Children that are born are holy*: by reason of the Prerogative of that Seed and also the Instruction in their Education. *Else*, says he, *were they unclean.* But yet meaning to be understood thus; that the Children of the faithful are *designed* for Holiness,

Year after the Apostles 100.

'Holiness, and so for Salvation: that by a Pledge of such 'Hope he might plead for those Marriages which he would 'have to be continued. Otherwise[*or, as for any other mean-'ing*] he knew well enough what our Lord had deter-'mined, *Except one be born of Water and the Spirit, he 'shall not enter into the Kingdom of God:* that is, *he shall 'not be holy.* Thus every Soul is reckon'd as in *Adam*, so 'long till it be a new enrolled in Christ, and so long un-'clean, till it be so enrolled, and sinful, because un-'clean, *&c.*

§. 7. I have cited these Passages at large and all together, that the Reader may try if he can pick any coherent Sense out of 'em. It is the Property of warm Men, when they are speaking earnestly on one Subject and urging that, to overlash so as that when they are speaking on another with like Earnestness, they fall into Contradiction of what they said before. This Author in the places here first cited, treating of the *Necessity* of Baptism, speaks of that Necessity as absolute; and of those that die unbaptized, as lost Men: and is enrag'd at those that maintain that Faith without it is sufficient to Salvation. Yet afterward, when he is discoursing of the *Weight*, as he calls it, of Baptism, he advises several sorts of People to delay it; and to encourage 'em, tells 'em that if they should by that Delay happen to miss of it, *an entire Faith is secure of Salvation.*

The most probable guess that I can make of that which was his steady meaning (if he had any) is, that those who put off their Baptism negligently, or as slighting it, do, if they finally die without it, lose their Life: but that in those that put it off only that they may be fitter for it, and in a more likely Condition to keep it unstained, if by that means they happen to die without it, the Will and Purpose of being baptized shall be accepted for the Deed.

And when he is discoursing on the aforesaid Subject of the Weight of Baptism, he finds fault with the Custom of baptizing *Infants*, and would have them delay'd till they are able to understand and consider what they do: and then farther, till they are married: and if they do not marry, or if their Consort die, then farther till the Danger of Lust is over, which is frequently not till Old Age. A strange Advice, and which no Man either of the Ancients, or Moderns, either of the one or the other side in this Controversie do approve of. And to urge his O-

pinion

pinion the more, he ſpeaks of Infants as if they were innocent or ſinleſs, and ſo had no need of the Forgiveneſs of Sins granted in this Sacrament. Year after the Apoſtles 100.

Yet in the laſt cited place, when he is on another Theme, he plainly owns the Catholick Doctrine of original Sin in Infants, and that every Soul born of *Adam* is *unclean* and *ſinful*, and continues ſo till it be enrolled or ranked anew in Chriſt: and cites, as pertinent to their Caſe, the *Preſcription*, as he calls it, or the *Standing Rule*, John 3. 5. *Except any one be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into God's Kingdom.*

How to reconcile this Diverſity, I know not, unleſs his Meaning (when he would have ſpoke for good) were, That the Baptiſm of Infants, and of thoſe other ſorts of Perſons, ſhould be delay'd till the times he ſpeaks of, in caſe there were no Danger of Death in the mean while: but that in caſe of ſuch Danger it ſhould be adminiſtred preſently: in which caſe he ſays it is ſo neceſſary, that any one that is preſent (whether in Orders or not, ſo he determines it) ought to adminiſter it, or elſe he is guilty of the Perſons Ruine or Perdition.

§. 8. And I like this my Reſolution of his Opinion the better, becauſe I find it to be what ſeveral of each of the diſagreeing Parties do agree to have been his Senſe. For as (4) Mr. *Baxter* makes his Acknowledgement; *yet again I will confeſs that the Words of* Tertullian *and* Nazianzen *ſhew that it was long before all were agreed of the very Time, or of the Neceſſity of baptizing Infants before any uſe of Reaſon, in caſe they were like to live to Maturity.* So Mr. (5) *Danvers* his Antagoniſt owns this; *Tertullian* that, as Dr. *Barlow* tells us, was ſo great an Oppoſer of Infant-Baptiſm as irrational and unwarrantable, yet had this Fancy of baptizing a dying Child to ſave it. Some Body or other had ſo ſtrangely impoſed upon this Man, that he thought the modern Pædobaptiſts were aſham'd to own this Doctrine, that a Child or other Perſon is to be baptized that he may be ſaved. Alſo (6) Mr. *Tombs* ſays, *If he* [Tertullian] *did allow it, it was only in caſe of Neceſſity, as may appear by his Words in his Book* de Animâ *c.* 39. And to name one of the Church of *Rome*, *Vaſquez* ſays, that *thoſe places in the Book* de Animâ, *and thoſe where he makes Baptiſm neceſſary to Salvation, do not prove that he recanted his Opinion,* (7) *for he might well enough aſſert that Baptiſm is neceſſary for all, and yet think that it was not to be given before adult Age in any other caſe but only that of extreme Neceſſity.* This

(4) More Proofs Pt. II. Ch. 4. Sect. 59.

(5) 1ſt Anſwer to Willis p. 9.

(6) Examen of Marſhal's Sermon pag. 10.

(7) in 3iam partem Thomæ. Tom. 2. Diſp. 154. c. 1.

Year after the Apostles 100.

This Explication of his Meaning is also confirmed from the older Editions of this Book *de Baptismo*, which instead of those Words in *Rigaltius*'s Edition, *Quid enim necesse est sponsores*, &c. what need is there that Godfathers, *&c.* read thus; *Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores*, &c. What Occasion is there, except in case of Necessity, that the Godfathers, *&c.* So it is in the Edition of *Pamelius*: and so, as *Pamelius* affirms, *Gaigneus* the first Editor of this Book *de Baptismo* has it. But I have followed the Edition which I had, which is *Rigaltius*'s (only leaving a Blank at the place) supposing he had some ground from the Manuscripts to leave out that Clause. Yet it cannot be denied that he has (as Mr. *le Clerc* (8) observes) set some Passages false, that were true in the former Editions, nor that he has otherwise shewn himself partial for the Antipædobaptists, as I shall shew hereafter, *Part* II. *Chap.* XI. §. 5. And therefore I incline now to the Opinion, that the old Editions are the truest, and that it ought to be read, *except in case of necessity*. And then the case is plain how his meaning was.

(8) Quæstiones Hieronym. Q. 9. c. 3.

§. 9. But that which most deserves the Readers Observation is, that the Words of *Tertullian* do not import that the *Custom* of the Christians at that time was to leave Infants unbaptized: but on the contrary, they plainly intimate that there was a Custom of baptizing 'em: only he describes that that Custom should be generally used. For when he says, *why does that innocent Age make such hast*, &c. His Words shew the matter of Fact to have been so, together with his Opinion against it. But the thing we now enquire of, is the Practice of the Church, and not one Doctor's Opinion, especially when it does not appear that any Body was prevail'd on by him to alter that Practice; for there is no Appearance that either the *Montanists* (to whom he turn'd) or the *Tertullianists* (whom he set up) were against it. On the contrary, St. *Austin* reciting the Opinions of both these Sects, does not mention any such thing held by either of 'em, and says at other places, that he never read of any Sect that did deny it, as I shew hereafter.

(9) l. de hæresibus c. 26. & 86.

The same Observation ought to be made concerning the *Sponsors* or Godfathers whom he speaks of as used in the Baptism of Infants that could not answer for themselves. Which shews the great mistake of some of the more ignorant Persons among the Antipædobaptists, who derive

derive the use of Godfathers from I know not what *Pope* of *Rome* of late years: whereas this was within a 100 years of the Apostles. Year after the Apostles 100

§. 10. It is something a heedless Answer that he makes to those Words of our Saviour; *Suffer little Children to come to me*, &c. when he says, *let 'em come when they are grown up, when they understand*, &c. For that seems to be the very thing that the Disciples said when they rebuked those that brought 'em, for which Rebuke our Saviour blamed the Disciples. It is something a better Answer which the Antipædobaptists now a days give, *viz.* that our Saviour would indeed have Infants brought to him then in their Infancy, and before they understood, and that he bless'd 'em, &c. But we do not read that he baptized 'em. To which the other reply, that he declar'd the Love of God to 'em, by his blessing and embracing, and saying, *Of such is the Kingdom of God.* Which shews 'em to be capable of the Covenant of Mercy: and that Infants are expresly admitted to enter Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 10. *you, your little ones*, &c. and in the Old Testament had the Seal of the Covenant. From whence it will follow that it is no Absurdity by reason of their nonage, which is the only thing *Tertullian* argues from.

§. 11. In the same Book of Baptism, *c.* 5. he observes that the Heathen Nations also used Baptism, as a religious Rite, and particularly *in the Mysteries of* Apollo *and* Ceres *Persons were baptized, idq; se in regenerationem & impunitatem perjuriorum suorum agere præsumunt.* And they say, they do this for their *Regeneration* and the Pardon of their former Perjuries. And he says, *here we see the aim of the Devil imitating the things of God.*

§. 12. One thing more ought to be observ'd out of the Passage I cited from *Tertullian*'s Book *de Animâ*, *viz.* that he expounds that Text, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now they are holy*, much after the same rate as many modern Pædobaptists do, of *baptismal* Holiness: only he thinks the Apostle speaks of it, not as then given, but as designed for them. He paraphrases, *Sancti*, Holy, by *sanctitati designati*, designed for Holiness, (*viz.* when they come to be baptized, as his following Words in the said Passage shew, if the Reader will turn back to 'em). This Sence of a baptismal Holiness the Antipædobaptists (who understand no more by it but that such Children are not Bastards,) would condemn as a new Exposition. But I shall shew by more Instances that will

come

Year after the Apostles 100.

come in my way, and especially in *CH. XIX.* §. 19. where I compare together all the Expositions of this Text given by the Ancients, that it was the most general one.

§. 13. It is plain that St. *Austin* and *Pelagius* and several others that manag'd the *Pelagian* Controversie, had never seen *Tertullian*'s Book of Baptism. For when St. *Austin* (13) pleaded that no Christian, Catholick, or Sectary, had ever taught to the contrary, but that one Reason for the baptizing of Infants was for the Forgiveness of original Sin; *Pelagius* granted (14) that there was none that denied that they were to be baptized: But when he, and *Celestius*, and *Julian* do ransack Antiquity for places to shew that they are baptized on other Accounts, and not for Forgiveness; how neatly would that Saying of *Tertullian* have fitted 'em; *What need their innocent* [ or sinless] *Age make such hast for the Forgiveness of Sin?* Or else we must say, they would not quote it, because he contradicts himself in this point. Or else they would not use his Authority, which was in no good Repute, because he revolted to *Heresy*: tho' Dr. *Allix* concludes this Book to have been written before.

(13) See CH. XIX. §. 17.

(14) See CH. XIX. §. 30.

It was customary in those times, if any one made use of *Tertullian*'s Authority in any controverted Matter, to stop his Mouth with that (15) Saying of St. *Hierom, illum hominem ecclesiæ non fuisse*; that *Tertullian* was not a Man of the Church: and *Pelagius* had a great Mind (if it had been possible for him continuing in his Opinion of denying original Sin) to have continued a Member of the Catholick Church.

(15) adv. Helvidium.

*Baronius* likewise observes, that when the *Donatists* maintain'd against St. *Austin* and the Catholicks, that Baptism given by *Hereticks* is null, and the Party must be baptized again; if St. *Austin* could have shewn that this Opinion was first set on foot by *Tertullian* (whose Name was in ill repute for his singular Opinions) that that one thing would have served much to discredit it. And that he might have done if he had ever seen this Book of Baptism, where that Opinion is asserted, *c.* 15. which is the earliest Mention we find of it.

Yet St. *Hierom* had seen this Book either in *Greek* or *Latin* (in both which Languages it was written) For he quotes some Passages out of it about the Story of St. *Paul* and *Tecla*, but nothing about the Matter of Infants.

CHAP.

# CHAP. V.

## Quotations out of *Origen.*

### *Homilia* 8. *in Levit. c.* 12.

§. 1. *AUdi David dicentem; In iniquitatibus, inquit, conceptus sum, & in peccatis peperit me mater mea: ostendens quòd quæcunq; anima in carne nascatur, iniquitatis & peccati sorde polluitur: & propterea dictum esse illud quod jam superiùs memoravimus; quia nemo mundus à sorde, nec si unius diei fuerit vita ejus. Addi his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit, cùm baptisma ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari: cùm utiq; si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet & indulgentiam pertinere gratia baptismi superflua videretur.*

Year after the Apostles 110.

'Hear *David* speaking: I was, *says he*, conceived in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother bring me forth: *Shewing that every Soul that is born in the Flesh is polluted with the Filth of Sin and Iniquity: And that therefore that was said which we mention'd before; that* none is clean from Pollution, tho his Life be but of the length of one Day.

'Besides all this, let it be consider'd, what is the reason that whereas the Baptism of the Church is given for Forgiveness of Sins, Infants also are *by the usage of the Church* baptized: when if there were nothing in Infants that wanted Forgiveness and Mercy, the Grace of Baptism would be needless to them.

### *Homil. in Lucam* 14.

§. 2. *Quod frequenter inter fratres quæritur, loci occasione commota [l. commotus] retracto. Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quorum peccatorum? vel quo tempore peccaverunt? aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus; nullus mundus à sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram? Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur & parvuli,*

Year after the Apostles 110.

'Having occasion given by this place, I will mention 'a thing that causes frequent Enquiries among the Bre- 'thren. Infants are baptiz'd for the Forgiveness of Sins. 'Of what Sins? Or when have they sinned? Or how can 'any Reason of the Laver in their Case hold good, but ac- 'cording to that Sense that we mentioned even now: '*None is free from Pollution, tho' his Life be but of the length* '*of one Day upon the Earth?* And it is for that Reason 'because by the Sacrament of Baptism the Pollution of 'our Birth is taken away, that Infants are baptized.

## *Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos, lib. 5.*

§. 3. *Deniq; & in lege pro illo qui natus fuerit, jubetur offerri hostia, par turturum aut duo pulli columbini: ex quibus unus pro peccato, alius in holocautomata. Pro quo peccato offertur hic pullus unus? nunquid nuper editus parvulus peccare potuit? Et tunc habet peccatum, pro quo hostia jubetur offerri, à quo mundus negatur quis esse etsi unius diei fuerit vita ejus. De hoc ergo etiam David dixisse credendus est illud quod supra memoravimus; quia in peccato concepit me mater mea: secundum historiam enim nullum matris declaratur peccatum. Pro hoc & Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quia essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam & Spiritum ablui deberent: propter quas etiam corpus ipsum corpus peccati nominatur.*

'And also in the Law it is commanded that a Sacrifice (1) Levit. 12. 8. 'be offer'd for every Child that is born; *a pair* (1) *of* 'turtle Doves, or two young Pigeons: of which one is for 'a Sin-Offering, the other for a Burnt-Offering. For what 'Sin is this one Pigeon offer'd? Can the Child that is new 'born have committed any Sin? It has even then Sin, for 'which the Sacrifice is commanded to be offer'd; from 'which even he *whose Life is but of one Day* is denied to 'be free. Of this Sin *David* is to be supposed to have 'said that which we mention'd before; *In Sin did my* 'Mother conceive me: for there is in the History no account 'of any particular Sin that his Mother had committed.

'For, this also it was, that the Church had *from the* 'Apostles a Tradition [or, Order] to give Baptism even to 'Infants. For they, to whom the Divine Mysteries were 'committed, knew that there is in all Persons the natural

'Pollu

'Pollution of Sin, which must be done away by Water and 'the Spirit: by reason of which the Body it self is also 'called *the Body of Sin.* Year after the Apostles 110.

§. 4. The Plainness of these Testimonies is such as needs nothing to be said of it, nor admits any thing to be said against it. They do not only suppose the Practice to be generally known and used, but also mention its being order'd by the Apostles.

But concerning the Authenticalness of 'em there does need something to be said. For the *Greek* (which is the original) of all *Origen's* Works being lost, except a very few, there remains only the *Latin* Translations of 'em. And when these Translations were collected together, a great many spurious ones were added and mixt with 'em, and went under *Origen*'s Name. But upon the renewal of Learning, the Criticks quickly smelt 'em out, and admitted none for his, but such as appear'd to have been done into *Latin* either by St. *Hierom* or else by *Rufinus*: both which lived within the time limited for our present Enquiry, *viz.* the first 400 Years. 278. 298.

For which reason I have rejected the Quotations brought by some for Infant-Baptism out of *Origen* on *Job*, which is plainly a spurious Piece written by some *Arian.*

§. 5. Of these which I have brought, the *Homilies* on St. *Luke* were translated by St. *Hierom*: but those on *Leviticus* and the *Comments on the Epist. to the Romans*, by *Rufinus*. St. *Hierom* added a Preface to his Translation, which is printed with it; a Passage out of which is quoted by *Rufinus*, (2) and also some part of the Translation it self. And St. *Hierom* himself mentions this Work in the Catalogue of his own (3) Works. So that of this there is no doubt. *Erasmus* once doubted whether even these Homilies were the genuine Works of *Origen*, as *Huetius* observes in these (4) Words: *Erasmus in his Epistle to* Francis Ciglianus, *had written that these Homilies did seem to be some other Man's and not* Origen's: *but in his* Censure *affixed to the Books of* Origen, *he recanted his Opinion, and acknowledged the true Author.* Which I the rather note, because Mr. *Tombs* (5) and Mr. *Danvers* (6) do quote *Erasmus* on *Luke* 1. 3. saying thus, *For so he seems to think whoever he was whose Commentaries are extant upon* Luke, *under the Title of* Adamantius, [or, Origen]. From whence they conclude *that* Erasmus *took 'em not to be* Origen's, *or at least doubted* of it. Which is not fair, if they knew that *Erasmus* had recanted his

(2) Apolog. adv. Hieronym. 2da.
(3) de Scriptoribus Eccl.
(4) Origeniianorum, l. 3. p. 253.
(5) 3d Review.
(6) 1st Reply to Mr. Wills. p. 87.

Year after the Apostles 110.

Doubt, as is to be seen in his Edition of *Origen's* Works.

§. 6. Neither does any one raise any Question of the Translation of the other two, on *Leviticus* and the *Romans*, but that it was done by *Rufinus*. But these two Men used several Methods in translating. For, whereas *Origen's* Books contained in them several Expressions not consistent with the Faith in some Points. St. *Hierom* (7) changed nothing, but express'd every thing as it was in the original, as he owns himself: but *Rufinus* alter'd or left out any thing that he thought not Orthodox. And in the *Homilies on Leviticus* he himself says, that he took a greater Liberty than ordinary.

(7) vide Erasmum in censurâ operum Origenis.

All the World since have approved the Method of St. *Hierom*, and blamed that of *Rufinus*: for it is fit for a Translator to give a true Account of what his Author says, be it good or bad: whereas now in these Translations of *Rufinus*, the Reader *is uncertain* (as *Erasmus* angrily says) *whether he read* Origen *or* Rufinus.

Some Antipædobaptists do for this reason reject the Quotations here brought out of the Homilies on *Leviticus* and the *Romans*: it being uncertain whether they are the Words of the Author, or the Additions or Interpolations of the Translator. This Plea must needs give some Abatement to the Authority of these two Testimonies: yet it is the less in this Matter, because,

1. That on St. *Luke* translated by St. *Hierom* contains the same thing in effect: It is as full an Evidence of the then Practice: only it does not mention the Tradition from the Apostles.

2. There is no kind of Probability that *Rufinus* (whatever Interpolations he might make in other Matters) made any Alteration in this: since this was none of the Subjects on which *Origen's* Opinion was question'd by the Church in *Rufinus*'s time. Those things on which he was singular, are largely canvass'd both by St. *Hierom* and *Rufinus* themselves in their Invectives and Apologies one against another: and also by (8) *Epiphanius*, and (9) *Theophilus* Bp. of *Alexandria*, who reckons 35 singular Opinions that *Origen* held: and they are about the Resurrection of the same Body, the Eternity of Hell Torments, the Præexistence of Souls, some Expressions about the Trinity, *&c.* but not one Word about this Matter. And there is no Pretence that *Rufinus* had any other occasion to alter any thing, but only as being a great Lover of *Origen*, whatever was in his Comments express'd in a doubtful

(8) Epist. ad Joannem Hierosolymit.

(9) Epistola Paschales B.P. tom. 4.

ful or heterodox Sence concerning any of the aforesaid Points, he left it out, or else gave it a favourable turn in the Translation, or in some Explication that he added. But what is this to the Baptism of Infants, concerning which it is not pretended that *Origen's* Enemies challeng'd him as holding any singular Opinion?

Year after the Apostles 110.

3. *Rufinus* (who confesses that in the Translation of the Comments on *Leviticus*, he had used more freedom) says only this of his Management in the Translation of the Comments on the *Ep. to the Romans*, that he had (10) *shortned this Work by one half.* He speaks of no addition to that: and it is in that that there is Mention of the Tradition from the Apostles.

(10) Peroratio in Epist. ad Romanos.

§. 7. Mr. *Tombs* (11) says, that *if one read these Passages, and consider how they are brought in, and how plain the Expressions are against the* Pelagians, *one shall conceive that they were put in after the* Pelagian *Heresie was confuted by* Hierom *and* Austin, *who often tells us, that the Fathers afore that Controversie arose, did not speak plainly against the* Pelagians. *And of all others* Origen *is most taxed as* Pelagianizing.

(11) Examen, pag. 7.

If the Passages did speak of, or relate to any Contest about the Doctrine of original Sin, or any Adversaries to it; or did set themselves to prove it as a thing controverted: this Exception would have some weight. But they speak of it as a supposed and known thing from Scripture, and as of a thing denied by none, and in no other Style than many Sayings of other Fathers do before *Pelagius*'s time, some of which I cited (12) out of *Irenæus*. And the Opinion in which *Origen Pelagianiz'd*, was not as Mr. *Tombs* would intimate, in denying that corrupt State in which all are born into this World (his asserting of that in many other places is notorious, and he built his Opinion of Præexistence on it) but in affirming that it is possible for a Man in this Life to arrive at such a perfect Conquest of the said Corruption, that he may afterward live without Sin: which was another of the false Doctrines of *Pelagius*. This is plainly proved to have been the Opinion of *Origen* from the few Words of St. *Hierom* in the *Prologue to his Dialogues against the Pelagians*; where having recited the Opinions of some former *Heretics* that vaunted themselves to be without Sin, he adds, *Illud autem Origenis proprium est*, &c. *But* Origen *had this peculiar Opinion, that it is impossible for a humane Soul to be without Sin from its Beginning to its Death: and* &c.

(12) CH. III. §. 1.

Year after the Apostles 110

*the other side, that it is possible, when a Man turns himself to a good Life, to arrive to such Strength, that afterwards he shall not Sin.* It was on account of this Tenet that St. *Hierom* calls *Origen the* Pelagians *beloved.* Which he does at the latter end of the last of the Dialogues above-mention'd.

§. 8. But this Argument of Mr. *Tombs* may be well retorted against those that think these Passages were put in by *Rufinus* ( Mr. *Tombs* in one part of his Discourse seems to lay it on him, and yet in another, seems to think they were put in by some body afterward: or else he speaks absurdly when he makes it to be done after the *Pelagian* times). For whoever had put in any thing of original Sin, *Rufinus* would not: he had been more likely to raze it out, if he had not been afraid of Censure. For tho' he seems to have conceal'd his Opinion from the World, except some few confidents, it was proved after his Death, that he was an Enemy to the Doctrine of original Sin, at least as derived from our first Parents. St. *Hierom* does once or (13) twice reckon him by the Name of *Grunnius* among the Precursors, or those that had given Occasion, to *Pelagius.* He himself tells how some had accus'd him to *Anastasius* Bishop of *Rome*, as having unsound Opinions about the Origin of the Soul: and he makes but a lame Answer to it, in the Letter which he writes to him for his Apology. But *Celestius* discover'd all, when being upon his Trial at a Council of *Carthage*, ( in which he was condemned for his Heresie ) there were these Examinations and Answers, which St. *Austin* has quoted (14) out of the *Acts* of that *Council*, which was held *Anno Dom.* 412.

(13) Ep. ad Ctesiphontem it. Præfat. l. 4. in Jeremiam.

312.

(14) lib. de peccato originali, c. 3, 4.

The Bishop *Aurelius* said,

' *Let the rest* [of the Articles charged on him ] *be read.*

' And there was read, *That the Sin of* Adam *hurt himself only, and not Mankind.*

*Celestius* answer'd,

' *I said, that I was unresolved concerning the Derivation of Sin (yet so as to submit to any one to whom God has given the Grace of Knowledge ) because I have heard different Opinions of this from those that have been Presbyters of the Catholick Church.*

*Paulinus* the Deacon said, *Tell us their Names.*

*Celestius* said,

' *The holy Presbyter* Rufinus, *who dwelt at* Rome *with holy* Pammachius, *I have heard him say, that there is no Derivation of Sin.*

' *Paulinus*

Year after the Apostles 110

'*Paulinus* the Deacon said, *Is there any more?*
'*Celestius* said, *I have heard others also say the same.*
'*Paulinus* the Deacon said, *Tell us their Names.*
'*Celestius* said, *Is not one Presbyter enough for you?*

And afterward, in another place [of the Acts]

'*Aurelius* the Bishop said, *Let the rest of the Charge be read.*

'And there was read, *That Infants when they are born are in the same State that* Adam *was in before his Transgression.*

'*Aurelius* the Bishop said, *Did you ever teach so,* Celestius, *that Infants,* &c.

'Celestius said, *Let him explain how he means*; Before his Transgression, *&c.*

'*Aurelius* the Bishop said, *Whether the State of Infants now to be baptized, be such as* Adam's *was before his Transgression: or, whether they do derive the Guilt of Transgression from the same sinful Origin from whence they are born? This is what the Deacon* Paulinus *would hear from you.*

'*Paulinus* the Deacon said, *Whether he has taught that or not, Let him deny.*

'*Celestius* said, *I told you before concerning the Derivation of Sin, that I have heard several in the Catholick Church deny it: and some I have heard affirm it. It is a matter of Question* [or Controversie] *not of Heresie. As for Infants, I always said, that they stand in need of Baptism, and that they ought to be baptized,* &c.

We see that tho' *Celestius* pretended he could have named others, yet he named none but *Rufinus*, who was dead, as holding this Tenet. *Rufinus* therefore was not likely to insert any thing into *Origen's* Works about original Sin.

I know that *Garner* the Jesuite would have it, that the *Rufinus* intended by *Celestius* was another of the same Name, and not he whose Works we have: and that because *Mercator* calls him a *Syrian*; whereas this *Rufinus* whose Works we have, was of *Aquileia*. But others with more reason think, that *Mercator* calls him a *Syrian* only because he lived 30 Years in *Syria* and those *Eastern* Parts, and brought his Errors, and his Love of *Origen*, from thence. And the *Rufinus* meant by *Celestius* has always been taken for the same that is ordinarily known by that Name.

Year after the Apostles 110.

There would have been the less need of this long Disquisition to prove that the forecited Passages of *Origen* are genuine, if that Passage of his which Mr. *King* has found out in the original *Greek* of his Commentaries on St. *Matthew*, and produces (*a*) to this purpose as an Evidence for Infant-Baptism, were not a very ambiguous one. If the Sentence had ended there where Mr. *King* cuts it off, it had been a plain case that *Origen* must have been understood to speak there of Infants in Age. But some Words, which he has left out, do, when they are read with the rest, very much puzzle the Cause, and make it doubtful whether *Origen* be to be there understood of Infants in Age, or of such Christian Men as are indued with the Innocence and Simplicity of Infants. The impartial Management which I have promis'd, obliges me to set down the whole place, or else none of it.

(*a*) Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, *&c.* of the Primitive Church pag. 57.

*Origen* is there commenting on those Words of our Saviour, *Mat.* 18. 10. *Take heed that ye despise not one of these Little-ones: for I say unto you, that in Heaven their* Angels *do always behold the Face of my Father which is in Heaven.* He has a long Discourse, and something rambling: speaking sometimes of Infants in Age (such as our Saviour had one then before him mention'd, *v.* 2.) and sometimes of Men resembling Infants. After which he puts this Question,

*Comment. in Mat. Tom.* 13. *pag.* 331. *Ed. Huetij, Rhotomag.* 1668.

Εἶτα πάλιν ζητήσειεν ἄν τις, πότε τῶν δεικνυμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος μικρῶν οἱ λεγόμενοι αὐτῶν Ἄγγελοι παρίστανται; πότερον ἐξ ἀμφοῖν τὴν οἰκονομίαν περὶ αὐτοὺς διοικεῖν ἀφ᾽ οὗ διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, ᾧ ἐγεννήθησαν, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν καὶ ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθοῦσι, καὶ μηκέτι ὑποκείμενοι πονηρᾷ τινι δυνάμει; ἢ ἀπὸ γενέσεως, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ προγνῶσιν καὶ τὸν προορισμὸν αὐτοῦ, &c.

*Then again one may inquire; When it is that the Angels here spoken of are set over those little ones shewed* [or signified] *by our Saviour? Whether they take the Care and Management of 'em from the time when they by the washing of Regeneration, whereby they were new born, do,* as new born Babes desire the sincere Milk of the Word, *and are no longer subject to any evil Power? Or from their Birth, according to the Fore-knowledge of God and his predestinating of 'em,* &c.

If

If *Origen* meant to say, that it is a Question whether such a little Child as our Saviour then set before the Apostles, have his guardian Angel given him by God from his Birth, or from his Baptism; then 'tis a plain Supposal that such Infants were baptized. But his Mention of their desiring of the Milk of the Word at the time of their Baptism, makes it doubtful whether he meant of such who are Infants in a proper Sence, or whether he had in his Mind at that place such Men as he had before called *Christ's Little ones, i. e.* Men, who when converted and baptiz'd, do become humble in Spirit, &c. And this Doubt is encreased by observing the Answer that he gives to this his own Question: for he says, that for one side of it (*viz.* that the Guardian Angel is given to every one from his Birth) these places of Scripture do make; *God (b) who separated me from my Mother's Womb.* And (c) *Before thou camest forth out of the Womb, I sanctified thee,* &c. But for the other side (*viz.* that it is at Baptism that the good Angel is given) this does make, that *the time of People's Unbelief is under the Angels of Satan: and then after their New-birth, he that has bought us with his own Blood, delivers* 'em *to a good Angel.* He has also another Fancy; that possibly the evil Angel that presides over a Man during his Heathenism, is at the Man's Conversion converted also himself, and becomes a good Angel to him.

Year after the Apostles 110.

(b) Gal. 1.15.
(c) Jer. 1. 5.

Moreover in the Text it self; tho' our Saviour had begun his Discourse with taking a little Child, and telling 'em they must *humble themselves as that little Child*; yet in the Process of it (and before he came to speak the forecited Words) *viz.* at *v.* 6. he uses the Phrase of *Little ones which believe in him.*

So that upon the whole, the Proof of Infant-Baptism from this place of *Origen*, does labour under considerable Ambiguity: and it is better for the Pædobaptists not so to rely upon it for a Proof of *Origen's* Sence, but that they do adhere likewise to those Passages of his which I recited before; which tho' they are but Translations of such Books of his, the Original whereof is not now extant, yet they are, as I have shewn, Translations well attested.

I will add to this, one Passage more, in which *Origen* brings in this Text of Scripture, which is,

Year after the Apostles 110.

## *Hom. 9. in Josuam.*

He is speaking of that Text, *Jos.* 8. 33. how *Joshua* wrote a Copy of the Law of *Moses* on the Stones of the Altar: and that he did it *in the Presence of the Children of Israel.* And in Allusion to this; speaking of our Saviour's writing his Law, not on Stones, but in the Hearts of his Disciples, he finds this way to prove that this also is done *in the Presence of the Children of Israel.* He says that the Word *Israel* signifies *a Mind that sees God*: and that that Definition fits well to *Angels*: and that the Angels are to be thought to be present at the giving of the Holy Sacraments. And then he adds,

*Secundum Domini sententiam dicentis de infantibus (quod & tu fuisti infans in baptismo) quia Angeli eorum semper vident faciem patris mei qui in cœlis est. Coram illis igitur filijs Israel, qui aderant illo tempore cùm tibi fidei Sacramenta traderentnr, videntibus faciem Dei, Jesus in corde tuo Deuteronomium scripsit.*

'According to that Saying of our Lord concerning Infants (and thou wast an Infant when thou wast baptiz'd) 'Their Angels do always behold the Face of my Father 'which is in Heaven. *So then* Jesus *wrote his Law in thy* '*Heart* in the Presence of those Children of Israel, *Beholders of God's Face, at the time when the Sacrament of* '*Faith was given thee.*

All that is doubtful in this place too, is, whether when he says, *Thou wast an Infant when thou wast baptiz'd,* he mean an Infant in Age, or only an Infant in the foresaid spiritual Sence. *Erasmus* takes it in the former Sence: for in his Edition of *Origen's* Works, he sets in the Margin of that place, the Word, *Pædobaptismus.*

Tho' this part of *Origen's* Works be not extant in *Greek*, yet we may the more depend upon it, because *Rufinus* assures us that in the Translation of these Homilies, and those on *Judges* he has neither added nor omitted any thing, but truly rendred what he found in the *Greek* Books. *Perorat. in Hom. ad Romanos.*

§. 10. There is one Circumstance that makes *Origen* a more competent Witness to give Evidence whether the baptizing of Infants had been in use time out of Mind, or not, than most other Authors that we have left to us of that Age: because he was himself of a Family that had

had been Christian for a long time. *Tertullian* and all the rest that we have mention'd, except *Irenæus*, must have been themselves baptized in adult Age; because they were of Heathen Parents, and were the first of their Family that turned Christians: but *Origen's* Father was a Martyr for Christ in the Persecution under *Severus*, the Year after the Apostles 102. And *Eusebius* (15) assures us that his Forefathers had been Christians for several Generations; τῷ τε γὰρ Ὠριγένει τὰ τῆς κατὰ χριστὸν διδασκαλίας ἐκ πεγόνων ἐσωζέτω. *The Christian Doctrine was conveyed to him from his forefathers.* or, as *Rufinus* (16) translates it, *ab avis atq; atavis*, 'From his Grandfathers and Great-'Grand-fathers.

Year after the Apostles 110.

(15) Eccl. H. l. 6. c. 19.

(16) l. 6. c. 14.

That which gave occasion to *Eusebius* to inquire into his Pedigree, was the Slander of *Porphyrius*: for he endeavouring to shew that the Christian Religion had nothing in it of Learning or Science, and had none but illiterate Followers; and not being able to deny or conceal the great Repute of *Origen* for his Skill in humane Literature, had feigned that he was at first a *Heathen*, and having learned their Philosophy, and then turning Christian, had endeavoured to transfer and apply it to *trim up the Christian Fables.* In Confutation of this Lye *Eusebius*, as I said, sets forth his Christian Descent.

Now since *Origen* was born *Anno* 185, that is, the Year after the Apostles, 85. (for he was 17 Year old when his Father suffer'd) his Grandfather, or at least his Great-Grandfather, must have lived in the Apostles time. And as he could not be ignorant whether he was himself baptiz'd in Infancy, so he had no farther than his own Family to go for Enquiry how it was practis'd in the times of the Apostles.

Besides that he was, as I said, a very learned Man, and could not be ignorant of the use of the Churches, in most of which he had also travelled: for as he was born and bred at *Alexandria*, so it appears out of *Eusebius* (17) that he had lived in *Greece*, and at *Rome*, and in *Cappadocia*, and *Arabia*, and spent the main part of his Life in *Syria* and *Palestine*.

(17) H. E. l. 6.

Appendix

CHAP.

# CHAP. VI.

## *Quotations out of* St. Cyprian.

### *Cypriani Epist.* 64. (*Pamelij Edit.* 59.) *ad Fidum.*

Year after the Apostles 150.

§. I. ST. *Cyprian* was Bishop of *Carthage:* and it was the Custom in that as in all other great and metropolitical Cities, for the neighbouring Bishops to meet there at certain times to consult of and determine any emergent Affairs of the Church.

At this time, *Anno Dom.* 253. there were 66 of 'em in Council. And one *Fidus*, a Country Bishop, had sent
253. a Letter with two Cases, in which he desired their Resolution; which they give in this Epistle to him.

One being about one *Victor* a Presbyter that after a Crime committed, had, by the Rashness of a certain Bishop, been admitted too soon to Absolution, is nothing to our Concern.

The other Question being, whether an Infant, before it was 8 Days old, might be baptized, if need required: I shall recite so much of the Letter as concerns that.

*Cyprianus & cæteri Collegæ, qui in Concilio affuerunt, numero 66. Fido fratri salutem.*

*Legimus literas tuas, frater carissime, quibus significasti de Victore quodam presbytero,* &c. ——

*Quantum verò ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sunt, constitutos baptizari non oportere: & considerandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquæ; ut intra octavum diem, cum qui natus est baptizandum & sanctificandum non putares, longe aliud in Concilio nostro omnibus visum est. In hoc enim quod tu putabas esse faciendum nemo consensit: sed universi potius judicavimus nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei & gratiam denegandam. Nam cùm Dominus in Evangelio suo dicat; Filius hominis non venit animas hominum perdere,*

*sed*

Year after the Apostles 150.

*sed salvare; quantum in nobis est, si fieri potest, nulla anima perdenda est. Quid enim ei deest, qui semel in utero Dei manibus formatus est? Nobis enim atq; oculis nostris secundum dierum secularium cursum accipere qui nati sunt, incrementum videntur. Ceterùm quæcunq; à Deo fiunt, Dei factoris majestate & opere perfecta sunt. Esse deniq: apud omnes sive infantes sive majores natu, unam Divini muneris æqualitatem declarat nobis Divinæ Scripturæ fides. Helizæus super infantem Sunamitidis viduæ filium qui mortuus jacebat, ita se Deum deprecans superstravit, ut capiti caput & faciei facies applicaretur, & superfusi Helizæi membra singulis parvuli membris, & pedes pedibus jungerentur. Quæ res si secundum nativitatis nostræ & corporis qualitatem cogitetur, adulto & provecto infans non posset æquari, nec cohærere & sufficere possent membra parva majoribus. Sed illic æqualitas divina & spiritualis exprimitur, quòd pares atq; æquales sint homines quando à Deo semel facti sunt, & possit ætas nostra in incrementis corporum secundum seculum; non secundum Deum habere discrimen. Nisi si & gratia ipsa quæ baptizatis datur, pro ætate accipientium vel minor vel major tribuitur cum spiritus sanctus non de mensurâ, sed de pietate atq; indulgentiâ paternâ æqualis omnibus præbeatur. Nam Deus ut Personam non accipit, sic nec ætatem; cum se omnibus ad cælestis gratiæ consecutionem æqualitate librata præbeat patrem. Nam & quòd vestigium infantis in primis partûs sui diebus constituti mundum non esse dixisti, quod unusquisq; nostrûm horreat exosculari: nec hoc putamus ad cœlestem gratiam dandam impedimento esse oportere. Scriptum est enim, omnia munda sunt mundis: nec aliquis nostrûm id debet horrere, quod Deus dignatus est facere: Nam etsi adhuc infans à partu novus est, non ita est tamen, ut quisquam illum in gratiâ dandâ atq; in pace faciendâ horrere debeat osculari: quando in osculo infantis unusquisq; nostrûm pro suâ religione ipsas adhuc recentes Dei manus debeat cogitare; quas in homine modo formato & recens nato quodammodo exosculamur, quando id quod Deus fecit amplectimur. Nam quod in judaicâ circumcisione carnali octavus dies observabatur, Sacramentum est in umbrâ atq; imagine antè præmissum, sed veniente Christo veritate completum: nam quia octavus dies: i. e. post sabbatum primus, dies futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret, & nos vivificaret, & circumcisionem nobis spiritualem daret: Hic dies octavus i. e. post sabbatum primus & Dominicus præcessit in imagine, quæ imago cessavit superveniente postmodum veritate, & datâ nobis spirituali circumcisione. Propter quod neminem putamus à gratiâ con-*

*sequendâ*

Year after the Apostles 150

*sequendâ impediendum esse eâ lege quæ jam statuta est, nec spiritualem circumcisionem impediri carnali circumcisione debere: sed omnem omnino admittendum esse ad gratiam Christi: quando & Petrus in Actis Apostolorum loquatur & dicat; Dominus mihi dixit neminem hominum communem dicendum & immundum. Ceterum si homines impedire aliquid ad gratiæ consecutionem posset; magis adultos & provectos & majores natu possent impedire peccata graviora. Porro autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus, & in Deum multùm ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, & à baptismo atq; à gratia nemo prohibetur: quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quòd secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contraxit? qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata. Et idcirco, frater carissime, hæc fuit in Concilio nostra sententia, à baptismo atq; à gratiâ Dei, qui omnibus & misericors & benignus & pius est, neminem per nos debere prohiberi. Quod cum circa universos observandum sit atq; retinendum; magis circa infantes ipsos & recens natos observandum putamus, qui hoc ipso de ope nostrâ ac de Divinâ misericordiâ plus merentur, quod in primo statim nativitatis suæ ortu plorantes ac flentes, nihil aliud faciunt quam deprecantur. Optamus te, frater carissime, semper benè valere.*

## Cyprian *and the rest of the Bishops who were present at the Council, Sixty Six in number, To* Fidus *our Brother, Greeting.*

'We read your Letter, most dear Brother, in which 'you write of one *Victor* a Priest, *&c.* ——— But as 'to the case of Infants: Whereas you judge *that they 'must not be baptized within 2 or 3 Days after they are born 'and that the rule of Circumcision is to be observed; so that 'none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth Day 'after he is born:* We were all in our Assembly of the 'contrary Opinion. For as for what you thought fitting 'to be done, there was not one that was of your Mind; 'but all of us on the contrary, judged that the Grace and 'Mercy of God is to be denied to no Person that is born. 'For whereas our Lord in his Gospel says, *The Son of 'Man came not to destroy Mens Souls* [or, Lives] *but to 'save 'em:* As far as lies in us, no Soul, if possible, is to 'be lost.

'For

'For what is there deficient in him who has been once 'formed in the Womb by the Hands of God? They ap- 'pear to us and in our Eyes to attain Perfection [or, en- 'creaſe] in the Courſe of the Days of the World: but 'all things that are made by God, are perfect by the 'Work and Power of God their Maker. The Scripture 'gives us to underſtand the Equality of the Divine Gift 'on all, whether Infants or grown Perſons. *Eliſha* in his 'Prayer to God ſtretched himſelf on the Infant Son of 'the *Shunamite* Woman that lay dead, in ſuch manner 'that his Head, and Face, and Limbs, and Feet were 'applied to the Head, Face, Limbs, and Feet of the 'Child: which, if it be underſtood according to the 'Quality of our Body and Nature, the Infant could not 'hold meaſure with the grown Man, nor its little Limbs 'fit and reach to his great ones. But in that place a ſpi- 'ritual Equality, and ſuch as is in the Eſteem of God, is 'intimated to us; by which Perſons that are once made 'by God are alike and equal: and our growth of Body by 'Age makes a difference in the Sence of the World, but 'not of God: unleſs you will think that the Grace it ſelf, 'which is given to baptized Perſons, is greater or leſs, ac- 'cording to the Age of thoſe that receive it: whereas 'the holy Spirit is given not by different Meaſures, but 'with a fatherly Affection and Kindneſs equal to all. For 'God, as he accepts no ones Perſon, ſo not his Age; but 'with an exact Equality ſhews himſelf a Father to all for 'their obtaining the heavenly Grace.

Year after the Apoſtles 150.

'And whereas you ſay, that *an Infant in the firſt Days 'after its Birth is unclean, ſo that any of us abhorrs to kiſs 'it.* We think not this neither to be any reaſon to hinder 'the giving to it the heavenly Grace. For it is written; '*To the clean all things are clean:* nor ought any of us to 'abhor that which God has vouchſafed to make. Tho' 'an Infant come freſh from the Womb, no one ought to 'abhor to kiſs it at the giving of the Grace and the own- 'ing of the Peace [or, Brotherhood] when as in kiſſing 'the Infant, every one of us ought, out of Devotion, 'to think of the freſh Handy-work of God: for we do in 'ſome ſence kiſs his Hands in the Perſon newly formed 'and but new born, when we embrace that which is of 'his making.

'That the eighth Day was obſerved in the *Jewiſh* 'Circumciſion, was a Type going before in a Shadow 'and Reſemblance, but on Chriſt's coming was fulfilled

'in

Year after the Apostles 150.

'in the Substance, for because the eighth Day, that is, 'the next to the Sabbath-Day, was to be the Day on 'which the Lord was to rise from the dead, and quicken 'us, and give us the spiritual Circumcision; this eighth 'Day, that is the next Day to the Sabbath, or Lord's-'Day, was signified in the Type before, which Type 'ceased when the Substance came, and the spiritual Cir-'cumcision was given to us.

So that we judge that no Person is to be hindred from 'obtaining the Grace, by the Law that is now appointed: 'and that the spiritual Circumcision ought not to be re-'strained by the Circumcision that was according to the 'Flesh: but that all are to be admitted to the Grace of 'Christ; since *Peter* speaking in the *Acts of the Apostles*, 'says, *The Lord has shewn me that no Person is to be called 'common or unclean.*

'If any thing could be an Obstacle to Persons against 'their obtaining the Grace; the adult and grown and 'elder Men would be rather hindred by their more 'grievous Sins. If then the greatest Offenders, and they 'that have grievously sinn'd against God before, have 'when they afterward come to believe, Forgiveness of 'their Sins; and no Person is kept off from Baptism and 'the Grace: how much less reason is there to refuse an 'Infant, who being newly born has no Sin, save that be-'ing descended from *Adam* according to the Flesh he 'has from his very Birth contracted the Contagion of 'the Death anciently threatned? Who comes for this 'reason more easily to receive Forgiveness of Sins, because 'they are not his own but others Sins that are forgiven 'him.

This therefore, dear Brother, was our Opinion in the 'Assembly, that it is not for us to hinder any Person from 'Baptism and the Grace of God, who is merciful and 'kind and affectionate to all. Which Rule, as it holds 'for all, so we think it more especially to be observ'd in 'reference to Infants and Persons newly born: to whom 'our help and the Divine Mercy is rather to be granted, 'because by their weeping and wailing at their first En-'trance into the World, they do intimate nothing so much 'as that they implore Compassion.

'Dear Brother, we wish you always good Health.

It is not denied by any but that this is a plain Proof of Infants Baptism being taken for granted at that time: since

since both *Fidus* who puts the Question, and the Council that resolve it, do shew by their Words their Sense to be that they are to be baptiz'd in Infancy; only *Fidus* thought, not before the eighth day. Year after the Apostles 1 50

Mr. *Tombs*, who makes some Exceptions against the foregoing Testimonies, as not being plain declarations of the Author's Mind, or not certainly genuine, (but yet no other exceptions than what I have mention'd) grants this to be plain, and to (1) *say enough, and more than enough, except it had spoke more to the purpose*, and would have it pass for *the spring-head of Infant Baptism.* (1) Examen, p. 10, 11.

§. 2. But there is one Antipædobaptist Writer, a Man of more boldness in his Assertions than the rest, that would represent this as a forged or supposititious piece. (2) *We would rather believe this*, saies he, *that these things were foisted into his Writings by that villanous cursed Generation, that so horribly abus'd the Writings of most of the Ancients.* (2) Danvers Treatise of Baptism, Part 2. ch. 3.

But as Mr. *Tombs* was more wary and learned than to object any such thing; so there could not have been any thing more unluckily pleaded. For so it happens, that in all Antiquity there is not any one piece that can more certainly be prov'd to be genuine than this: because it is so often quoted by St. *Hierom*, St. *Austin*, and others that liv'd a while after; not in any question of Infant Baptism, but of Original Sin, which the *Pelagians* denied; tho' they, as I shall shew hereafter, granted and practis'd Infant Baptism. I shall have occasion in the following Chapters to cite some of the Passages of the foresaid Fathers where they mention this Epistle of St. *Cyprian*; and at present shall refer the Reader to such places of St. *Austin*, where he transcribes large passages *verbatim* out of it, so as to recite it by parcels almost all.

In his *Ep.* 28. *ad Hieronym.* He, speaking of some that taught that the Body only, and not the Soul, must suffer for Original Sin, saies among other things this; *Blessed Cyprian, not making any new Decree, but expressing the firm Faith of the Church, in refuting those that thought a Child must not be baptized before the eighth day, said* (*not that no Flesh, but*) that no *Soul* must be lost.

And *l.* 4. *contra duas Epist. Pelagianorum, c.* 8. He recites three large passages out of it.

And *l.* 3. *de peccatorum meritis & remissione*, c. 5. having mention'd this Epistle, he tells *Marcellinus*, the Nobleman, to whom he writes; *You may if you please, read the Epistle*

Year after the Apostles 150.

*it self of the said Martyr about the Baptizing of Infants: for there is no doubt but it is to be had at* Carthage. *However I have thought fit to transcribe some part of it, as much as is necessary for our present Question,* [which was about original Sin.] So he begins where I began; *But as to the case of Infants: whereas you judge they must not be baptized within 2 or 3 Days,* &c. and goes on to repeat two large Paragraphs *verbatim* out of it.

(3) Serm. 14. de verbis Apost.

Also having occasion to (3) preach at *Carthage* against *Pelagianism*, he towards the end of his Sermon, recites to the People some part of this Epistle, telling 'em that *they are the Words of* Cyprian *an ancient Bishop of that See. Holy* Cyprian, says he, *was asked whether an Infant might be baptized before the eighth Day, because in the old Law it was not lawful to circumcise but on the eighth Day. The Question was of the Day of baptizing, for of original Sin there was no Question: and therefore from a thing of which there was no Question, the Question that was started was resolved.* St. *Cyprian said among other things*; So that we judge that no Person is to be hindred from obtaining the Grace, *&c.* [*proceeding to those Words*] because they are not his own but others Sins that are forgiven him. *See how he making no doubt of this Matter* [viz. of original Sin] *solves that of which there was doubt: he took this from the Foundation of the Church to strengthen a Stone that was loose.*

St. *Hierom* also quotes a good part of it *verbatim l.* 3 *Dialog. adv. Pelag.*

§. 3. Since then it is plain that it was at that time, and in those places where St. *Cyprian* had liv'd, commonly known for his, and frequent in the Hands of learned Men; there is the less need of considering those Objections which are brought as probable against its being genuine.

The foresaid Author says, *We meet with no such Council neither can it appear where it was held.*

But this is to make himself more ignorant than he is, as if he did not know that the Date of this is before those times in which the Acts of Councils used to be registred and collected into Volumes: so that this had been lost, if it had not been preserv'd among the Epistles of this Father. And besides, that they never us'd to put into the Volumes of Councils the Acts of those ordinary Assemblies in which the neighbouring Bishops met every half Year at the principal City (whereof this was one

viz.

*viz.* St. *Cyprian's* neighbouring Collegues assembled at *Carthage*) but only those in which some extraordinary Matter was handled.

Year after the Apostles 150.

§. 4. Yet this is proper to observe here, that whereas (4) *Grotius* would prove that *Infant-Baptism was not universally held to be* necessary, *because in the* Councils *one finds no earlier Mention of it than in the Council of* Carthage, meaning that in the Year 418. We see here that tho' that were true (which I shall by and by (5) shew to be false) that there were no earlier Mention of it in those Councils that are in the ordinary Collections: yet there is mention of it in this, that was earlier than any of 'em; and tho' met on ordinary Occasions, more numerous than several of 'em.

(4) Annot. in Mat. 19.

(5) CH. XVI.

§. 5. It is objected likewise, that whereas St. *Austin* somewhere (6) lays down this as a Rule, that *what the whole Church thro' all the World does practice, and yet it has not been instituted in Councils, but has been always in use, is with very good reason supposed to have been settled by Authority of the Apostles*, and applys that Rule to Infant-Baptism; he consequently takes it not to have been instituted by any Council; and therefore that he contradicts himself when he believes there was such a Council as this Letter mentions.

(6) de baptismo contra Donatistas l. 4. c. 23.

But there needs nothing but for a Man to open his Eyes to see that this Council does not *institute* the Baptism of Infants, or enact that they should be baptized; but takes that for granted, or as a thing known and supposed by both Parties, that they are to be baptized, and determines only that Question, whether they may be baptiz'd before the eighth Day. Which very thing St. *Austin* notes in the Words I just now cited *Ep.* 28. Cyprian *not making any new Decree*, &c.

§. 6. Another Exception that is made, has I think, some Truth in it, *viz.* That some of the Reasons used in this Council and express'd in this Letter, do appear something frivolous and shallow. But I do not see how it is at all to the purpose.

1. Because these Reasons are not design'd to prove Infant-Baptism, but to take off the Objections concerning the eighth Day.

2. If they had been us'd by these Bishops as Grounds of Infant-Baptism; yet since our Enquiry is what the Church then practis'd, and not how able St. *Cyprian* and

Year after the Apostles 150.

they were to argue, their Evidence is the same, how weak soever their Reasonings are. But,

3. This also may be said in Apology for their Abilities, that to a frivolous and foolish Question or Objection 'tis almost impossible to give any Answer that will not seem frivolous to those that consider not the Occasion of it. On this Account *Irenæus*, and many of the Fathers suffer in our Judgment: they are forc'd to write a great deal in Confutation of such idle and enthusiastical Stuff as seems to us not to deserve three Words: but it was necessary then to disentangle the Souls of ignorant Christians. So any Book written now in answer to the Reasonings of the *Quakers*, &c. will in the next Age seem to be the Work of a Man that had little to do. This *Fidus* thought that the natural Uncleanness of an Infant in the first Days after his Birth, was a Reason against baptizing it then, which, as *Rigaltius* observes, was a Relique of heathenish Superstition. He also seems to have made some Question whether so young an Infant be a perfect humane Creature: as if eight Days made any great difference in that Matter: The Answers to such Arguments will seem of little Weight. All that he objected of Sence, was the Rule of Circumcision on the eighth Day. To which St. *Cyprian* answers, as other Fathers do, that the Circumstance of the Day was typical, and so not now obliging.

§. 7. If we look back from this time to the space that had passed from the Apostles time, which was but 150 Years, we must conclude that it was easie then to know the Practice of Christians in the Apostles Days. For some of these 66 Bishops must be thought to be at this time 70 or 80 Years old themselves, which reaches to half the space: and at that time when they were Infants there must have been several alive that were born within the Apostles Age. And such could not be ignorant whether Infants were baptiz'd in that Age, when they themselves were some of those Infants.

It is plain likewise that there was no dispute or difference of Opinion (as there must have been among so many, if any Innovation had been made). For 'tis here said, *there was not one of* Fidus's *Mind* that Infant-Baptism must be delayed till the eighth Day. Much less then was there any of Opinion that it was not to be us'd at all.

*In a Doctrinal Point*, as Mr. *Baxter* well obſerves, *a Miſtake is eaſier, or in a bare Narration of ſome one Fact: But in a matter of Fact of ſo publick Notice, and which ſo many thouſands were Partakers in, as Baptiſm was, how could they be ignorant?* Suppoſe it were a Queſtion now among us, Whether Perſons were baptiz'd at Age only, or in Infancy alſo, 70 or 80 Years before we were born, were it not eaſie to know the Truth, what by Tradition, and what by Records? Year after the Apoſtles 150.

§. 8. I ſhall conclude what I have to note on this Teſtimony with obſerving theſe things.

1. That it was the Cuſtom of thoſe times and places to give the new baptiz'd Perſon, whether Infant or Adult, the *Kiß of Peace*, or as it is called by (7) St. *Paul* and (8) St. *Peter*, *the Holy Kiß*, or the *Kiß of Charity*, in token of their owning him for a Chriſtian Brother: for *Fidus* makes that a part of his Objection, that that would be indecent or loathſome in the caſe of a new born Infant, before it be a Week old. (7) 1 Cor. 16. 20. (8) 1 Pet. 5. 14.

§. 9. 2. That theſe Biſhops held, that to ſuffer the Infant to die unbaptiz'd, was to endanger its Salvation. This appears in their Reaſonings.

§. 10. 3. The third is a various reading or ſpelling of one Word in this Epiſtle, from whence ſome Diſputes have ariſen. Mr. *Daille* in a Book written on purpoſe to publiſh the *Nævi* and Errors which he could find in the Fathers Works, (9) reckons St. *Cyprian* one of the firſt of thoſe from whoſe Words one may prove there was a Cuſtom of giving the Holy Communion to Infants. And he proves it firſt and chiefly from this Epiſtle, in which, as 'tis here written, there is never a Word about it. But where we read in the firſt Clauſe of it, *baptizandum & ſanctificandum, ſhould be baptiz'd and ſanctified*, (which latter Word is commonly uſed as another Word for Baptiſm) he quotes it, *baptizandum & ſacrificandum*, by which he underſtands, *ſhould be baptiz'd and partake of the Euchariſt*. Some Editions, it ſeems, have it ſo. But, I ſuppoſe, very few: and thoſe miſtaken ones. For (10) Dr. *Hammond*, (11) *Marſhal*, and the *Magdeburgenſes*, and Mr. *Walker*, and all that I have ſeen, do quote it *ſanctificandum*, as it is alſo in the laſt Edition, *viz. Oxon.* 1682. in which are the various Lections of ſeveral Manuſcripts that had been collated: but no Variety in reading of this Word. And the matter is out of doubt; ſince (9) de uſu Patrum. l. 2. c. 4. (10) Six Queries inf. bapt. §. 36. (11) Against Tombs p. 36

Year after the Apostles 150.

St. *Austin*, transcribing that part of the Epistle (13) writes it *sanctificandum.* And indeed *sacrificandum* in that sence is not *Latin.*

(13) I. 4. contra duas Epist. Pelagianorum c. 8.

From this use of the Word *Sanctification* for *Baptism*, and *sanctified* or made holy for *baptized* ( which I shall shew (14) hereafter to have been very common and usual ) the Fathers do give light to the Explication of that Text of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. As I shall more fully shew at a fitter place.

(14) CH. XI. §. 9.

(15) CH. II. §. 2.

4. We see also here confirm'd, what I said (15) before, that they reckon'd Baptism to be to us in the room of Circumcision. For it was upon that account, that *Fidus* thought it must keep the times of the old Circumcision: and the Bishops of the Council, tho' denying that, do call it *the Spiritual* [ or Christian] *Circumcision.*

## Another Passage out of St. *Cyprian*, is

### *Libro de lapsis, circa Medium.*

§. 11. There had been at *Carthage* a great Persecution of the Christians, in which many had fallen, and had denied their Religion, and had joined in the idolatrous Sacrifices: some of which afterward, when the Persecution was over, went about to crowd themselves into the Church, without giving first any sufficient Proofs of their Repentance for so horrid a Crime, or expecting the Consent of the Church for their Re-admission. St. *Cyprian* thought it necessary for these Men to be first made sensible of the Guilt they had contracted: for which purpose he writes this Book; and has among others, this Passage, in which he mentions their Infants; and tho' there be no express Mention of their Baptism, yet you will see it is in other Words plainly described.

*Nonne quando ad Capitolium sponte ventum est, quando ultro ad obsequium diri facinoris accessum est, labavit gressus, caligavit aspectus, tremuerunt viscera, brachia concederunt? Nonne sensus obstupuit, lingua hæsit, sermo defecit? Stare illic potuit Dei servus, & loqui & renunciare Christo, qui jam Diabolo renunciarat & seculo? Nonne ara illa, quò moriturus accesserat, rogus illi fuit? Nonne Diaboli altare, quod fœtore tetro fumare ac redolere conspexerat, velut funus & bustum vitæ suæ, horrere ac fugere debebat? Quid hostiam secum, miser, quid victimam supplicaturus imponis? ipse ad aras*

*aras hostia, victima ipse venisti. Immolasti illic salutem tuam; spem tuam, fidem tuam funestis illis ignibus concremasti. Ac multis proprius interitus satis non fuit: hortamentis mutuis in exitium suum populus impulsus est: mors invicem lethali poculo propinata est. Ac ne quid deesset ad criminis cumulum, infantes quoq; parentum manibus vel impositi vel attracti, amiserunt parvuli quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant consecuti. Nonne illi, cùm judicij dies venerit, dicent; nos nihil fecimus, nec derelicto cibo ac poculo Domini ad profana contagia sponte properavimus: perdidit nos aliena perfidia, parentes sensimus parricidas. Illi nobis ecclesiam matrem, illi patrem Deum negarunt: ut dum parvi & improvidi & tanti facinoris ignari per alios ad consortium criminum jungimur, alienâ fraude caperemur?*

Year after the Apostles 150.

'When you came to the Capitol, [*the Idol Temple*] 'when you went with a ready Compliance to the com- 'mitting of that horrible Crime, Did not your Legs 'tremble, your Sight wax dim, your Bowels turn, and 'your Arms flag? Did not your Mind grow amazed, 'your Tongue falter, and your Speech fail you? Could 'one that was God's Servant stand there and speak out, 'and renounce Christ, who had before renounced the 'Devil and the World? Was not the Altar of Incense a 'funeral Pile to him, since he came thither to take his '[*spiritual*] Death? Had he not reason to abhor and fly 'from the Altar of Sacrifice to the Devil, which he saw 'smoak and stink with a nasty Smell, as from the fune- 'ral Fire which signified the Forfeiture of his Life? 'What need hadst thou, poor Wretch, to bring thy Of- 'fering or Sacrifice thither with thee? Thou cameſt thy 'self a Sacrifice and a Burnt-Offering to the Altar. Thou 'didst there sacrifice thy Salvation: thou didst burn up 'all thy *Hope* and *Faith* in those deadly Fires.

'There were also a great many that thought it not e- 'nough to procure their own Damnation. The multi- 'tude encourag'd one another to their Destruction: they 'drank Death to one another, and pledg'd each other in 'that poysonous Cup.

'And that nothing might be wanting to the Measure 'of their Wickedness, their little Infants also being led 'or brought in their Parents Arms, lost that which they 'had obtain'd presently after they were born. Will not 'they at the Day of Judgment say, *We did nothing of 'this, neither did we forsaking the Meat and Cup of our Lord,*

Year after the Apostles 150.

*run of our own accord to the partaking of those prophane Defilements. 'Twas the Apostacy of others that ruin'd us: we had our Parents for our Murderers. 'Twas they that renounced for us the Church from being our Mother, and God from being our Father. When we, being young and inconsiderate, and not sensible of the Greatness of the Crime, were made Partakers of the Wickedness, we were entrapp'd by the Treachery of others.*

§. 12. When he says, *the Infants lost* [or forfeited] *that* [Gift or Grace] *which they had obtained presently after they were born:* 'tis plain that he means their Baptism or the Benefits thereof. St. *Austin* had occasion to recite these Words of St. *Cyprian* and to give his Comment on them. The occasion was this; one *Boniface* had put to him this Question; *Whether Parents do their Children that are baptized any hurt when they carry 'em to the Heathen Sacrifices to be cur'd of any Illness: And, if they hereby do 'em no hurt, then how it comes to pass that the Faith of the Parents stands 'em in stead when they are baptiz'd: and yet their Apostacy afterward should not be able to hurt 'em?*

(16) Ep. 23. ad Bonifacium

St. *Austin* (16) answers, that *the Force of that Sacrament is such, that he that is once regenerated by it, cannot afterwards be entangl'd in the Guilt of another Person's Sin, to which he does not consent.* He gives the Reason of the Difference to this purpose; that the Guilt of original Sin descends from the Parent to the Child, because the Child is not as yet a separate living Person, *anima separatim vivens*, from his Parent. But when a Child is become *in seipso alter ab eo qui genuit*, in himself a separate Person from him that begot him, he is not guilty of his Parents Sin done without his Consent. He derived his Guilt, because he was one with him and in him from whom he derived, at the time when it was derived to him: but one does not derive from another, when each has his own proper Life; so as it may be said, *the Soul that sinneth, it shall die.* That the Faith and godly Will of the Parent in bringing his Child to Baptism, is available, because the same Spirit that sanctifies and regenerates the Child, moves the Parent to offer him to Baptism. *The regenerating Spirit*, says he, *is one and the same in the Parents that bring him, and in the Infant that is brought and regenerated.* ——— *And the Guilt is not so communicated by another Person's Will, as the Grace is communicated by the Unity* [or identity] *of the Spirit.*

*Yet* (as he obſerves afterward) *the Parents or other Guardians that endeavour thus to entangle their Children or other Infants in this Sacrilege of the Devil, are deſervedly called ſpiritual Murderers. For they do not, 'tis true, effect any Murder upon 'em, but yet as far as lies in them they are Murderers: and we do with reaſon ſay to 'em,* Don't murder your Infants. *For the Apoſtle ſays,* Quench not [or extinguiſh not] the Spirit: *not that he can be extinguiſhed; but yet they are fitly called extinguiſhers of him as much as in them lies, that would have him extinguiſhed.* Year after the Apoſtles, 150.

Then it is that he takes notice of this Paſſage of St. *Cyprian,* and ſays, *In this ſenſe may that be rightly underſtood which St.* Cyprian *wrote in his* Epiſtle *concerning the* Lapſi, *when reproving thoſe that had in the time of Perſecution ſacrificed to Idols, he ſays,* 'And that nothing might 'be wanting to the Meaſure of their Wickedneſs, their 'little Infants alſo being led or brought in their Parents 'Arms, loſt that which they had obtained preſently after 'they were born, *&c. They loſt it, he means, as far as concerns the Wickedneſs of thoſe by whom they were brought to loſe it, in the Will and Purpoſe of thoſe that committed ſo foul a Wickedneſs upon 'em. For if they had loſt it indeed as to themſelves, they would have continued as Perſons to be condemned by the Sentence of God without any Excuſe: which if St.* Cyprian *had thought to be ſo, he would not preſently have ſubjoined their Excuſe, ſaying,* 'Will not they at the 'Day of Judgment ſay? *&c.*

§. 13. There is one place more in St. *Cyprian,* where he ſpeaks of all Perſons in general, yet becauſe he names not Infants particularly, I ſhall but juſt mention it. It is

## *Libro* 3. *Teſtimoniorum ad Quirinum, c.* 25.

This is a Common-place-Book of the Heads of Chriſtian Doctrine, collected by this Father, and proper Texts of Scripture added for the Proof of each of 'em.

The Doctrine or Propoſition for this Chapter is this.

*Ad regnum Dei niſi baptizatus & renatus quis fuerit, pervenire non poſſe.* 'If any one be not baptiz'd and regenerate, he cannot come to the Kingdom of God.

The

Year after the Apostles 150.

The Texts of Scripture are among other, these

*In Evangelio cata Joannem. Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ & spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei: quod enim natum est de carne, caro est; & quod natum est de spiritu, Spiritus est. In the Gospel according to St.* John. 'Except any one be regenerate of Water and of the Spi-'rit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God: for that 'which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh: and that which is 'born of the Spirit, is Spirit.

We have in our *English* Language a way of speaking whereby instead of the Word [Person] in a Sentence; we generally use the Word [Man] tho' the Sense be such as requires to be understood of any human Creature; Man, Woman, or Child: And so in the Text of St. *John* here cited, *John* 3. 5. tho' the original be ἐὰν μή τις, &c. and all *Latin* Books and Writers translate it, as *Cyprian* here does, *nisi quis*, &c. which signifies, *except one* [or except *any one*, or, except *a Person*] *be born*, &c. Yet the *English* Translators have rendred it, *Except a Man be born*, &c. And some *English* Antipædobaptists (learned ones you'll say) have taken the Advantage of the Word [Man] to prove that it is of a grown Person in Exclusion of Children, that our Saviour speaks. But the more wary of 'em finding that this Argument will from the original turn strongly against 'em, are willing to compound, and leave this Text quite out of the Dispute, and say that our Saviour does not there speak of Baptism at all.

There is not any one Christian Writer of any Antiquity in any Language, but what understands it of Baptism. And if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a Person is born of *Water*, any more than born of Wood.

(17) Part 2. CH. VI. §. 1.

I shall have occasion to speak more (17) particularly of the Sense of the Ancients concerning this Text. In the mean time, we see here plainly that St. *Cyprian* understands it of Baptism: and also we see by reading the foregoing Epistle to *Fidus*, that he and his Fellow-Bishops understood the Case of Infants particularly to be included in it.

There is another Passage in St. *Cyprian*, from which is plainly infer'd the Baptism of Infants, because it shews that in his Church the Custom was to give the Commu-

nion

nion to them at the Age of 4 or 5 Years. But since it mentions not their Baptism expressly, I shall reserve it to the (18) Chapter where I speak of the Custom that was in some Churches of their communicating.

Year after the Apostles 150

(18) Part 2. CH.IX. §.15, 16, 17.

---

# CHAP. VII.

## Quotations out of the Council of *Eliberis*.

### *Concil. Eliberitanum. Can.* 22.

§. 1. *Si quis de Catholicâ Ecclesiâ ad hæresim transitum fecerit, rursusq; ad ecclesiam recurrerit: placuit huic pœnitentiam non esse denegandam, eo quòd cognoverit peccatum suum: qui etiam decem annis agat pœnitentiam; cui post decem annos præstari communio debet. Si vero infantes fuerint transducti; quòd non suo vitio peccaverint, incunctanter recipi debent.*

Year after the Apostles 205.

'If any one go over from the Catholick Church to any 'Heresie [or Sect] and do return again to the Church: 'It is resolved that Penance be not denied to such an 'one; because he acknowledges his Fault. Let him 'be in the State of Penance for ten Years, and after ten 'Years, he ought to be admitted to Communion.

'But if they were Infants when they were carried 'over; inasmuch as it was not by their own Fault that 'they sinned, they ought to be admitted presently.

Here is indeed no express Mention of these Infants having been baptized in the Catholick Church before they were carried over to the Sect. But inasmuch as they are said to be *transducti*, *carried over* from the Catholick Church, it is, I think, plainly implied. For the Phrase of all Antiquity is not to call any one of the Church, till he be baptized. Be he Infant or Adult that is designed to be a Christian, till he be baptiz'd, they call him *Catechumenus*: and a *Catechumen* is not yet of the Church. We perceive by St. *Austin* in many (1) places, that it was a common thing for the Neighbours or any Visitant, to ask concerning a Christian's Infant Child; Is he *fidelis* or *catechumenus*? *i. e.* is he yet baptiz'd or not? So that an

(1) Serm. 14. de verbis Apost. & alibi.

Year after the Apostles 205. an Infant or adult Person was not reckon'd *fidelis* or of the Church till his Baptism. And therefore to speak of Infants conveyed over from the Catholick Church to any Sect, is to suppose them first baptiz'd in the Catholick Church, and afterward by their Parents or others carried to the Congregations of the Sectaries, and educated in that way. The Council decrees that such upon their Return to the Catholick Church shall be received without any Penance.

Concerning the time of this Council, I shall not enter into any of the nice Inquiries. Almost all Chronologers place it as I here do, *viz.* Anno Dom. 305. *Baluzius* will have it to be 10 or 15 Year later. A main Exception against moving the Date of it any lower, is, that a great many of the Canons of it do enact what Penance is necessary in the several Cases of such as thro' Fear do deny the Christian Religion, or comply to sacrifice to the Idol Gods. This is a Sign that Persecution reigned at that time, at least in *Spain:* but every Body knows that a little after this time Persecution for the Christian Religion ceased in all the World.

§. 2. That which will make a Reader, that is not acquainted with Antiquity, wonder, is, that these ancient Fathers do inflict so severe a Penance on those that had run into any Sect. They ordain that such must be kept in a State of Penance (*i. e.* of Humiliation and asking Pardon of God and the Church) for ten Years time before they be admitted to full Communion: except they were Infants when they were carried over.

The Commonness of a Sin does in most Men wonderfully abate the Sense of the Guilt of it. Now a days if Men have run into Schism, and do afterwards think fit to return to the Church, they are so far from being sensible of any Guilt that they have incurred, that they think their very Return does lay a great Obligation on the Church. In short, many Christians, that take the Word of God, not as it lies, but as their Prejudices have represented, do think that Adultery indeed is a Sin, and Drunkenness is a Sin, but that Schism is none.

But all the Ancient Christians do express the same Sentiment of the Guilt of Schism as St. *Paul* does, who (2) reckons those that make *Divisions*, *Seditions*, and *Heresies* in the Church, among the most capital Offenders, *which shall not inherit the Kingdom of God:* such as Murderers,

(2) Gal. 5. 19, 20.

Murderers, Adulterers, &c. And commands that they be excommunicated, or (3) avoided by all good Christians. Nor has God ever passed any Act of Indulgence or Toleration in Abatement of that Law.

Year after the Apostles 205.

(3) Rom. 16. 17.

---

## CHAP. VIII.

## A Quotation out of the Council of *Neocæsarea.*

§. 1. THO' this Council mentions nothing at all about Infants or their Baptism, yet *Grotius* (1) seems to himself to have found a Proof out of it that many in that Age judged that they are not to be baptized. Bp. *Taylor* (2) from him, and from them others, prosecute the Argument.

Year after the Apostles 214.

(1) Annot. in Mat. 19. 14.

(2) Liberty of Prophecying.

So much is plain, that some about that time and place had put this Question; Whether a Woman with Child, that had a Mind to become a Christian and be baptiz'd, might conveniently receive Baptism during her going with Child, or must stay till she was deliver'd. And 'tis agreed likewise that the Reason of the Doubt was, because when she was immers'd into the Water, the Child in her Womb did seem to some to be baptized with her: and consequently they were apt to argue that that Child must not be baptiz'd, or would not need to be baptiz'd afterward for it self This any one will conclude from the Words of the Council, which are these;

### *Concilij Neocæsariensis, Canon 6.*

Περὶ κυοφορούσης, ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι ὁπότε βούλεται· Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τῷ τικτομένῳ· διὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι.

*A Woman with Child may be baptiz'd when she pleases: For the Mother in this matter communicates nothing to the Child: because in the Profession every ones own* [or peculiar] *Resolution is declared.* [or, because every ones Resolution at the Profession is declar'd to be peculiar to himself.]

§. 2.

Year after the Apostles 214.

§. 2. The Argument of the Antipædobaptists from this Passage, is, that both those that raised the Doubt, and the Council that resolved it, must have been of Opinion that it is unlawful to baptize an Infant.

For, say they, those Men that scrupl'd the baptizing of a Woman with Child, scrupled it for this reason, because they thought that in so doing they baptiz'd the Child too; which to do had been no Absurdity supposing the Baptism of an Infant to be lawful: it would have been only the doing of both under one.

And also the Fathers of the Council, say they, do seem to grant that the baptizing of the Child would be unlawful: for they give that Reason why they allow the baptizing of the Woman, *because her Baptism communicates nothing to the Child.*

And besides, the Fathers (as these Men construe their Words) do determine that in the baptismal Profession every Person must declare his own Choice or Resolution: which it is impossible for the Infant in the Womb, or any other Infant to do.

§. 3. The Pædobaptists say, that this is a wide Mistake of the meaning of those that rais'd the Doubt, and of the Council in resolving it. For that it was no more than this.

They that scrupled the baptizing of such a Woman, scrupled it for this reason, because it would be a disputable Case whether the Child in her Womb were to be accounted as baptiz'd by its Mother's Baptism or not: and so when that Child was born, they should be in great Perplexity whether they must baptize it or not. For if they did, there would be Danger that it would be baptized twice: and if they did not, 'twas questionable whether it had any Baptism at all. And that therefore it was better the Woman should stay till she were deliver'd and then she might be baptiz'd for her self and the Child for its self.

But the Bishops in Council (considering, as 'tis likely, the Danger of the Woman's Death in the mean while) determined otherwise; that she might be baptiz'd if she would: and that there was no ground for the foresaid Scruple or Perplexity about the Child's Baptism; for that it was a plain Case that the Child is not to be accounted as baptiz'd by its Mother's Baptism. For that such a Woman's Baptism reaches no farther than her self, and is not communicated to the Child in her Womb;

and

and gives this Reason, because *the Profession that any one makes at Baptism, declares* ἰδίαν προαίρεσιν, *a Resolution* [or Desire to be baptiz'd] *that is peculiar to themselves:* and so the Woman in this Case does not desire or demand the Baptism at that time for her Child, but for her self only. Year after the Apostles 214.

§. 4. If the Reader will please to turn back and read the Words once again with any Attention, he will see that they are, as to the main of the Determination, applicable to either of these Senses. If the Bishops had thought baptizing of Infants unlawful, they would have determined this Case much as they do: but it is no kind of Proof that they didt hink so; because if they meant only to take away the Perplexity about baptizing the Child, when born, they must also determine it as they do.

But the learned Reader will likewise observe, that there is something in the Propriety of Phrase in the last Clause that does incline it to this latter Sense; and that is the Notation of the Word, [ἴδιος] which properly signifies any thing *peculiar to ones self*; and the Repetition of the Article, τὴν before the Words ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ.

If the Bishops had meant to determine that the Child could not be suppos'd to be baptiz'd with its Mother for this Reason, because in baptismal Profession every one must declare his own Choice; and so an Infant could not be baptiz'd: they would have express'd that latter Clause thus, διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον δεῖν ἑαυτοῦ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δεικνύναι, *because every one must make his own Choice at the Profession.* But when they say διὰ τὸ ἑκάστε ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι, they do (as any Critick will observe) express this Sence; *because the choice which is made at the* [baptismal] *Profession, is declar'd by every one peculiar to himself.* And so it is only a Reason of what they had said last; *that the Mother communicates nothing to the Child:* and not any Reason against the baptizing of an Infant.

§. 5. Before I go farther, I esteem it very material to observe by the bye this Emphasis of the Word ἴδιος, for apprehending the force of a Text of St. *Paul* against the *Polygamists.* These Men presume to say, that there is no Prohibition in the New-Testament of the Plurality of Wives to one Man. St. *Paul,* 1 Cor. 7. 1, 2. perswades people, if they can be so content, to an absolute Continence; but if they cannot, he allows Marriage: but

Year after the Apostles 214.

but with this Limitation, ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω. The true Translation of which Words is, *Let every Man have his own Wife, and let every Woman have a Husband peculiar to her.*

For as when *Aristotle* says, ἴδιον τοῦτο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις: it were a very imperfect rendring to translate it; *Men have this of their own*: which ought to be, *This is proper, or peculiar, to Men.* And where he says, ὁ δὲ βάτραχος ἰδίαν ἔχει τὴν γλῶσσαν: to say, *Frogs make their own Noise*, would not reach the Sence: which is, that *Frogs make a Noise peculiar to themselves.* So it is an imperfect Translation of the foresaid Words of the Apostle, which our *English* gives, *Let every Woman have her own Husband.* The Word signifies, *one peculiar to her.*

§. 6. But to return to our Business, *Grotius* among the Arguments with which he endeavours to uphold the Cause of the Antipædobaptists, produces two Commentators on this Canon, *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, who (as he would represent their Meaning) interpret it as if the Council had understood Infant-Baptism to be unlawful. *Grotius*'s Words are these; (3) *How much soever the Commentators draw it to another Sence, it is plain that the Doubt concerning the baptizing Women great with Child, was for that Reason, because the Child might seem to be baptiz'd together with its Mother; and a Child was not wont to be baptiz'd but upon its own Will and Profession. And so* Balsamon *explains it*, Compend. Canon Tit. 4. 'That cannot be inlightned [or baptiz'd] because it is 'not yet come into the Light, nor has any choice of the 'Divine Baptism. *And also* Zonaras, 'The Child that 'is now in the Womb has need of Baptism then when it 'shall be able to choose.

(3) Annot. in Mat. 19. 14.

Any one that reads this, would conclude that *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* at least, (if not the *Neocæsarean* Fathers) were Antipædobaptists: if he be one that does not understand that there are most full and evident Records of the time in which these two Men lived (which was the 12*th* Century) and that there was then no such thing as Antipædobaptism in the *Greek* Church, in which *Balsamon* was Patriarch of *Antioch.*

§. 7. *Rivet, Marshal*, &c. do accuse *Grotius* of Partiality and foul Dealing in general in his pleading the Cause of the Antipædobaptists, and particularly in this place. And tho' the Opinion of *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* be not of that Moment as to make it worth the while to

repeat

repeat their Words (since they had at that distance no better Opportunity of knowing the Mind of the Council than we now have) yet I will set them down something at large, that the Reader may see if he can acquit that great Man of the Crime of Prevarication.

Year after the Apostles 214.

*Balsamon's* Comment on that Canon is this; *Some had said 'That Women which come over from the Heathens to 'the Church great with Child ought not to be baptized, but 'to stay till they were deliver'd; least when the Mother is 'baptized, the Child in her Womb do seem to be baptized too, 'as being altogether united to her: and so when it is born 'it will either be left unbaptized; or if it be baptiz'd it 'may be accounted to be twice baptiz'd. The Fathers therefore not allowing this Contradiction, appointed that such Women may be baptiz'd without any Scruple when they please: for that the Woman has nothing common with the Child in her Womb in the concern of Baptism: especially, say they, when as to every one in Baptism his own Promising is necessary. But the Embryo* [ἐστραμμένον διαθέσεως] *having not the Qualification* [or Disposition, or Affection] *cannot make the Profession at Baptism. And that Clause,* when they please, *was added to the Canon because of some that say,* 'Before the Embryo be formed into a Humane Creature, 'the Woman may be baptized without Scruple, but not 'conveniently afterward; because the Child in her 'Womb then is in the same case as Infants newly born, 'which may not [*lege* may] promise. *The Fathers therefore said, that it is at the Woman's Pleasure to be baptiz'd* when she will; *because in what State the Embryo is none can tell, nor be Sponsor for it: but Infants do promise by their Sponsors, and being actually baptiz'd have the heavenly Illumination granted to 'em.*

And in his Glosses upon *Photius's Nomocanon,* Tit. 4. c. 10. he says, *There was a Question made, whether a Woman with Child might be baptized: for some said,* 'Because the Child in the Womb is united to the Mother 'as a part of her, and cannot be inlightned [or baptized] 'with the Mother, because it is not yet come into the 'Light, nor has any Choice of the Profession of the Divine Baptism; therefore the Mother ought not to be 'baptiz'd, but to stay till the Child be born: least one 'part of her be inlightned, and the other remain uninlightned. And if the Child be baptiz'd with the Mother's 'Baptism; then, if it be baptiz'd after it is born, it will 'prove to be twice baptiz'd, which is absurd. *Therefore*

Year after the Apostles 214. *the Synod of* Neocæsarea *resolve the Doubt in their Sixth* Canon, *&c.*

*Zonaras*'s Words are these in his Comment on the said Canon. *It determines that Women with Child may be baptiz'd when they please. And whereas some affirmed* ' *that* the ' Fœtus is baptiz'd together with the Mother, and that ' therefore the Infant when born must not be baptiz'd, least it should have a double Baptism: therefore were those Words added, ' For the Mother in this Matter com- ' municates nothing to the Child. *i. e. For the Mother only and not the Child is made Partaker of holy Baptism. For, says it, every ones own choice is requisite that they do profess themselves Followers of Christ, and it appears by that Baptism which they receive with a willing Mind. And because in the Fœtus that is inclosed in the Mother's Womb there is no choice, it is not to be accounted to have received Baptism; and therefore it has need of Baptism again when it shall be able to choose.*

These two Commentators do indeed understand the last Clause of the Canon in that Sence which I shewed even now not to be the true Sence, nor according to the Rules of Criticks. But yet it was not fair in *Grotius* to represent them as being themselves, or supposing the Council to be, against Infant-Baptism: since as it appears that they suppose every ones Choice to be necessary at Baptism, so it likewise appears that an Infant's Choice and Promise made by its Sponsors or Godfathers is the Choice and Promise they speak of. Besides that he quoting Scraps of Sentences, produces as *Balsamon*'s own Words that which *Balsamon* had brought in as pleaded by others; and also something alter'd, as the Reader will see by comparing.

§. 8. The Issue of the Dispute is; the Council say in this Matter, what any one, whether Pædobaptist or Antipædobaptist would say; and therefore the Proof that they were of one or of the other Opinion must be taken from some other Evidence: for these Words make neither for the one nor the other. And since we are now come so low as within 60 Years of the time of St. *Austin*, *Pelagius*, &c. and they, as I shall shew (4) presently, do declare that they never read or heard of any Christians that were against Infant-Baptism; it were a strange thing to suppose that there should have been a Council so late as under the Reign of *Constantine*, as this Council was, and they never to have read or heard of it. No Man can

(4) CH. XIX. §. 17. & 29, 30. &c. ad 40.

can think but they had heard of this Council, which was but a little before the time of their Birth. 'Tis plain therefore that they took the meaning of it not to have been against Infant-Baptism. Year after the Apostles 214.

St. *Austin* sometimes speaks of this Case of a Woman baptiz'd while great with Child: and he does not only determine it as these Bishops do, but he speaks of it as a clear Case; perhaps because he knew it had been determined in this Council. He takes occasion to mention it, *l. 6. contra Julianum, c.* 5. where he is shewing the Weakness of that Argument of the *Pelagians*, who said, that if original Sin be the cause why Infants are baptiz'd, then the Child that was born of Christian and baptized Parents would not need to be baptized, as being born of those that were cleansed of that Sin, and of a Mother whose Body was the Temple of the Holy Spirit. He says among other things, this;

*That the Mother's Body should be the Temple of God, is the Benefit of Grace not of Nature: which Grace is conveyed not by Birth, but by Regeneration. For if that which is conceived in the Mother's Body did belong to it so as to be accounted a part of it, then an Infant whose Mother was upon some Danger of Death, baptized while she was great with him, would not need to be baptiz'd. But now when such an Infant is baptiz'd, he will not be accounted twice baptiz'd. Therefore when he was in the Womb of his Mother, he did not appertain to it: and yet he was formed in a Temple of God, but so as not to be himself the Temple of God.* And he has the same Instance over again, *c.* 6.

§. 9. Some learned Men have given their Conjectures of the Occasion of this Doubt, *viz.* what should make some people of this Country take up an Opinion; that if a Woman with Child were baptiz'd, her Child when born would have no need of Baptism: and they give a very (5) probable Account of it. Several *Jews* were dispers'd in these parts: and the *Rabbies* of the *Jews* had this Rule concerning the Baptism of Proselytes; *If a Woman great with Child become a Proselyte, and be baptized; her Child needs not Baptism when it is born*: as I shewed in the Introduction,

(5) Hammond six Queries, Inf. bapt. §. 109. Lightfoot. Hor. Hebr. Mat. 3.

# CHAP. IX.

## A Quotation out of *Optatus Milevitanus.*

Year after the Apostles 260.

§. 1. THIS Bishop living in *Africa* had occasion to write several Books against the Schism of the *Donatists.* Some part of the Controversie between them and the Catholicks was about Baptism: but not about Infant-Baptism, as a certain Writer of small Reading has mistaken the Matter. It was whether Baptism given by an ill Minister were valid, or must be renewed? and whether the Catholicks were so corrupt a Church as that all baptiz'd by them, whether in Infancy or at Age, must be baptiz'd afresh by some such pure Men as the *Donatists* were?

Otherwise the Doctrine and Practice of Baptism was the same with both the Parties.

This appears plainly by what this Author (1) says in way of perswading them to break off their Schism; *The Ecclesiastical Managements is one and the same with us and you. Tho' Mens Minds are at Variance, the Sacraments are at none. And we may say, we believe alike, and are sealed with one and the same Seal*: no otherwise baptiz'd than you, *nor otherwise ordain'd than you are. We read the Scripture alike: We pray to the same God. The Lord's-Prayer is the same with us and you,* &c. The same thing is (2) affirmed by St. *Austin.* He owns their Baptism, Ordination, *&c.* to be rightly perform'd: He blames nothing in them but their Separation. And by *Cresconius* the *Donatist,* who has these (3) Words to the Catholicks; *There is between us and you one Religion, the same Sacraments, nothing in the Christian Ceremonies different. It is a Schism that is between us, not a Heresie.*

(1) l. 3. de Schismate Donatist. prope finem.

(2) Epist. ad Theodorum Donatist.

(3) apud Augustinum l. 2. contra Cresconium. c. 3.

§. 2. But that which I mean to quote, and is all that he has occasion to say about Infant-Baptism is this.

Year after the Apostles 260.

## *Lib. quinto de Schismate Donatistarum* prope finem.

He had been there comparing a Christian's putting on Christ in Baptism, to the putting on of a Garment, and had called Christ so put on, *Tunicam natantem in aquis*, 'a Garment swimming in the Water. And then says,

*Sed ne quis dicat, temerè à me Filium Dei vestem esse dictum: legat Apostolum dicentem; Quotquot in nomine Christi baptizati estis, Christum induistis. O tunica semper una, & innumerabilis, quæ decenter vestiat & omnes ætates & formas: nec in infantibus rugatur, nec in juvenibus tenditur, nec in fæminis mutatur.*

'But lest any one should say, I speak irreverently, in 'calling Christ a Garment: let him read what the Apo-'stle says, *As many of you as have been baptized in the 'Name of Christ, have put on Christ.* Oh what a Gar-'ment is this, that is always one and never renewed, 'that decently fits all Ages and all Shapes! It is neither 'too big for *Infants*, nor too little for Men, and without 'any Alteration fits Women. He goes on to shew how it may be also compared to the Wedding-Garment, &c. This needs no note.

---

# CHAP. X.

## *A Quotation out of St.* Gregory Nazianzen, *concerning St.* Basil's *Baptism in his Infancy.*

§. 1. THIS Quotation might have been plac'd 30 or 40 Years sooner, (at which time St. *Basil* must have been born) because it recites a of matter Fact done then. But I set it at this Year, because this Author that mentions it, began at this time to be a Man of note in the Church, (a Presbyter and

Year after the Apostles 260.

Writer of Books, &c.) tho' he preach'd the Sermon that I shall cite about 20 Years after.

Some that have gone about to draw up a Catalogue of Persons not baptiz'd in Infancy, tho' born of Christian Parents, have reckon'd St. *Basil* among 'em: but the Evidence they bring, is out of spurious and forged Authors, as I shall shew in its place (1). And in the mean time I shall produce the Authority of a piece that all acknowledge to be genuine, which, I think, shews that he was baptiz'd in Infancy.

(1) Part 2. CH. III. §. 5.

St. *Gregory Nazianzen* was contemporary with St. *Basil*, and so well acquainted with him, as that 'tis impossible any one should have been more: and tho' he seems to have been something the older Man, yet he liv'd to preach a Sermon in Commendation of him, in the nature of a Funeral Sermon, tho' it was some time after his Death.

In that Sermon he recites several Passages of his Parentage, Birth, Life, and Death: And among them the Passage, which I take to relate to his Baptism, is penn'd in such a rhetorical and figurative Periphrasis, that taking it by its self, one is not sure whether he means Baptism by it or something else. But since the first reading of it, I have observ'd in another Discourse of his, the very same Description applied plainly and purposely to Baptism: which, together with the Probability that it carries in it self, convinces me (and I suppose will the Reader when he compares 'em) that it is so to be applied in that Sermon concerning St. *Basil*.

I shall first give the Words by which he describes Baptism, in his

## *Oratio in sanctum baptisma*; Or. 40. (2)

(2) prope ab initio.

Τρίσσην γένεσιν ἡμῖν δίδωσιν ὁ λόγος, τὴν ἐκ σωμάτων, τὴν ἐκ βαπτίσματος, καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως. Τούτων δὲ ἡ μὲν, νυκτερινή τέ ἐστι, καὶ δούλη, καὶ ἐμπαθὴς· ἡ δὲ ἡμερινὴ, καὶ ἐλευθέρα, καὶ λυτικὴ παθῶν, πᾶν τὸ γενέσεως κάλυμμα περιτίμησα, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω ζωὴν ἐπανάγουσα. ἡ δὲ φοβερωτέρα, καὶ συντομωτέρα, πᾶν τὸ πλάσμα συνάγουσα ἐν βραχεῖ τῷ πλάσῃ παραστησόμενον.

*Religion teaches us that there are three sorts of Birth or Formation. That of our Bodies; that of Baptism; and that of the Resurrection. The first of these is* of the Night, *and is servile, and tainted with Lust. The second is,* of the Day, *and is free, and powerful against Lust, and takes away*

*way all that Veil* [or Darkness] *contracted at our Birth,* *and renews us to the supernal Life. The last is more dreadful, and sudden, bringing together in a Moment all the Creation, to be set before their Creator.* Year after the Apostles 260.

And a little after, among other Titles that he gives to Baptism, he calls it πλάσματος ἐπανόρθωσιν, *the ammendment* [or rectifying] *of our Formation.*

All that I produce this here for, is to observe the Phrase, or Description that he gives to Baptism. He calls our *natural* Birth, nocturnal, or *of the Night*; but the *baptismal* Birth, diurnal, or *of the Day.* And *Nicetas* there observes, that the Name is taken from those Words of *David,* Psal. 139. 16. where the Translation of the *Septuagint* (which was in use with them, reads,) much different from our *English*) ὅτι τὸ βιβλίον σοῦ πάντες γεγράψονται ἡμέρας πλασθήσονται· *They shall all be written in thy Book, they shall be formed by Day.*

Now see what he says of St. *Basil, Orat. in laudem Basilij.* Orat. 20.

He had spoke of his Progenitors, many of whom were Martyrs for Christ, and of the Piety of his Father *Basil,* who, it seems was a Man in holy Orders: and of his Mother *Emmelia:* and making an end of that Prefatory Discourse, he says,

φέρε τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν θεωρήσωμεν. Τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου πάλαι, ὃν κοινὸν παιδευτὴν ἀρετῆς ὁ Πόντος τηνικαῦτα περιβάλλοιτο, σπαργανῶται καὶ διαπλάττεται πλάσιν τὴν ἀρίστην τε καὶ καθαρωτάτην, ἣν ἡμερινὴν ὁ Θεῖος Δαβὶδ καλῶς ὀνομάζει, καὶ τῆς νυκτερινῆς ἀντίθετον·

*Now let us contemplate the Affairs that relate to him himself. In the Beginning then of his Age he was by his excellent Father, who was at that time a publick Teacher of Virtue in the Country of* Pontus, *swaddled, as I may call it, and formed with that best and most pure Formation, which Divine* David *rightly names* of the Day, *and which is opposed to* that of the Night.

*Bilius* in his note on these Words says, *He means the Formation of Baptism, or rather of Manners: which* David *calls,* of the Day, saying they shall be formed by Day: *for so it is to be read. Which excellent Formation is opposite to* that of the Night, *which is by Copulation, and is sordid, and a Work of Darkness.*

But I believe *Bilius* had not animadverted (what I here observe) that it is the very same Phrase which he uses in the other Sermon, for Baptism. I also at the first

Year after the Apostles 260.

reading thought it uncertain which he meant, Baptism, or good Education in Manners: But the Likeness of a Phrase so singular seems to determine it. They of that time seem to have understood that Verse of the Psalm, as speaking before of the Christian Baptism.

This Formation appears to have been given in Infancy, both by the Words τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας, *in the Beginning of his Age*; and also by the Emphasis of the Word σπαργανῶται, which signifies the binding or first fashioning of the Body of an Infant in swaddling Cloths, and also by the orderly Method in which he proceeds: for he mentions in the next Paragraph to this, his *Childhood*, in which he was educated at home, and *by the Instructions that are first in order and proper for* a Child, *fitted for the Perfection he was to arrive at afterward*, (therefore the foregoing Paragraph must have referr'd to his Infancy) Then he proceeds to tell, that when he was a Boy big enough, he was sent to School to *Cæsarea*, then to *Byzantium*, and then to the University of *Athens*: where it was that *Gregory*, who knew him before (at *Cæsarea* I suppose) enter'd, as he says, into that strict League of Friendship with him which lasted during their joint Lives: and in which they seemed, as he expresses it, to have *both but one Soul informing two Bodies*. After this he relates how he went into Orders, and came, in process of time, to be Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and so famous a Man as he was.

From this methodical enumerating all the material Passages and Actions of his Life, arises another Proof that he must have been baptiz'd in Infancy; and that the Passage which I mention'd must be meant of that: because in all the Passages of his Life afterward, he never mentions any thing of his Baptism, which it had been impossible to omit if he had received it after any considerable time of his Life had passed.

Also I do not see what else he can mean than St. *Basil*'s Baptism in Infancy, by another Expression which he has in the same Oration. He is comparing *Basil* to each of the Patriarchs and holy Men of the Old-Testament, *Abraham*, *Moses*, &c. and he shews how he had something in his Temper, and in the Passages of his Life, like to something in every one of theirs. Among the rest he compares him to *Samuel*, and says,

Σαμουὴλ δὲ τοῖς ὀπκαλεμένοις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῷ ᾖ δῶρος περὶ γεννήσεως, ᾖ μετὰ τὴν γέννηση εὐθὺς ἱερεὺς, ᾖ χειρὶ βασιλείας ᾖ ἱερείας διὰ τὸ κέρας. Οὕτω δὲ ὃν ἐν βρέφει καθιερωμένῳ ὑπὸ μάτερος,

ᾖ

καὶ μετὰ τῆς διπλοΐδος ὁπλιδομένου τῷ βήματι; καὶ βλέπων τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ Κεστὸς Κυρίου, καὶ Κεστὴς τῶν τελουμένων ἐκ πνεύματος. Year after the Apostles 260.

Samuel *among them that call upon his Name was both given* [or promised] *before he was born, and presently after his Birth was consecrated, and he became an Anointer of Kings and Priests out of a Horn. And was not this Man* (Basil) *consecrated to God in his Infancy from the Womb, and carried to the Steps* [or Font] *in a Coat? Did he not become a* Seer *of heavenly things, and an anointed of the Lord, and an Anointer of such as were initiated by the Spirit?*

The Word βῆμα properly signifies *Steps*. It is ordinarily taken for a *Pulpit*, to which one goes up by Steps: and it may signify a Font or Baptistery, to which they did go down by Steps. But the Coat in which he says *Basil* was offer'd to God (alluding to the Child's Coat which was made for *Samuel* by his Mother) cannot well be supposed to have been any thing but the *Albes* used at Baptism. And this, he says, was in his Infancy.

The Instance of *Samuel* dedicated in Infancy, is one which this Father does at other places make use of for a Comparison or Example of a Christian's Child baptiz'd in Infancy: as will be seen in the next Chapter; where speaking to some tender Mothers that were afraid, it seems, of putting their Infants into the Water at Baptism, he says, *Thou art afraid as a faint-hearted Mother,* &c. *But* Hannah *before* Samuel *was born, devoted him to God: and when he was born, presently consecrated him, and brought him up in a priestly Coat.* The very thing that he says here of St. *Basil's* Parents.

---

## CHAP. XI.

### *Other Quotations out of St.* Gregory Nazianzen, *concerning the Doctrine of* Infant-Baptism.

§. 1. THIS Father was not himself baptiz'd in Infancy: and if it be true that he was born after the time that his Father was a Christian and in holy Orders (of which the Antipædobaptists do give probable Evidence) he had the most Reason of any

Year after the Apostles 260.

any one in those times to be prejudiced against the Doctrine of the Necessity of Infant-Baptism: which he could not urge himself, nor hear urged by others, without some Reproach thereby cast on the Conduct of his Father, for whom he always express'd a great Reverence; tho' other Writers give him but a mean Character, and shew that the (1) Son's Prudence aud Skill was found necessary to retrieve the Father's Credit and the Esteem of the People, and to preserve him from being over-witted by the *Arians*, or frighted by their Power.

(1) Greg. Presbyter in vitâ Naz.

So much is certain, that of all the Instances brought by the Antipædobaptists of Men who being baptiz'd Christians themselves, yet did not baptize their Children in Infancy, there is a better Appearance of Proof in this Man's Father's Case than in any other. Of which Instances I must treat more largely in a (2) Chapter on purpose: and at present give Account of what this Author himself speaks of the Doctrine of Infant-Baptism.

(2) Part 2. CH. III.

§. 2. All that I have to produce is taken out of his Sermon that I mention'd before, *viz.* his

## *Oratio de Baptismo.* Or. 40.

In which he both perswades those of his Hearers, who had not yet so throughly embrac'd Christianity as to be baptiz'd into it, that they would without Delay be Partakers of it, and also speaks something concerning the Necessity of it to Infants.

Of this Oration I will give a short Abstract, setting down the Original of such Passages only, as do, some way, affect the Question in hand.

After some Commendations of Baptism, he proceeds to mention the Names or Titles by which it is called: which are these; *The Gift, the Grace, Baptism or Washing, the anointing, the Laver of Regeneration, the amending of our Make*, or Formation, *the Seal*: and explains the Reason of these several Appellations.

Then having spoken of Man's natural and original Corruption, he says, *God has not left his Creature without a Remedy; but as he first made us, so he renews us by this divine Formation:* ἡ τοῖς μὴ ἀρχομένοις δῶρεὰ σφραγὶς, τοῖς τελειοτέροις τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ χάρισμα, καὶ τῆς πεσούσης εἰκόνος διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἐπανόρθωσις, *which as it is a Seal for such Persons as newly*

*ly enter into Life; so to those that are adult it is a Grace, and the restoring of the Image which they had lost.* Year after the Apostles 260.

Then he says, the Force and Effect of Baptism is, *A Covenant with God of a new and holy Life:* and argues from thence how careful we ought to be to keep it intire, *and that*, says he, ἐκ ἔστι δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως, *because there is no Regeneration to be had afterward.* Yet he grants there is Repentance afterward, but that leaves a Scar, and requires a long time, and many Tears; which we know not whether God will give us a space for. (They, as I observ'd before, gave the Name of *Regeneration* to no other but the baptismal renewing).

Then he warns 'em of the Tentations that they must expect after their Baptism, and how they must oppose and overcome 'em.

§. 3. Against the Delay of Baptism, he minds 'em of the Danger of missing it by sudden Death: and how much more creditable and comfortable it is to receive it voluntarily in the time of Health and Strength, than in time of Necessity on a Sick-bed, *when the Tongue falters, and can hardly utter the Words of the holy Initiation; and the Washing is more like the washing of a Corps than religious Baptism.* That a generous Mind will desire not only the Forgiveness of Sins, but also the Reward promised to virtuous Actions, for which there must some time be allowed between Baptism and Death. That there are three sorts of Persons very different, tho' all of 'em may be saved; *the Slave, the Mercenary, and the Son.* The first minds no more than the escaping of Punishment: the second regards nothing but the Pay: the Son's Mind is full of Duty and Love to his Father. That all other good things we desire to enjoy as soon as may be: and so we ought to do this Freedom from Sin.

That the Devil would indeed entice us to give him the present, and God the Remainder; him the Flower of our Age, and God the Dregs. But that we must consider the many Hazzards we are subject to: *the Chance of War, an Earthquake, the Sea, a wild Beast, a Disease, a Crumb of Bread, a Surfeit, a Precipice, a Horse, a Medicine, a Tyrant*, &c.

Then he answers the Pretences which the half Christians of those times made for their Delay. As, *I am afraid I shall not keep the Grace of Baptism unstained, and so will not take my Cleansing yet, as having none to take afterward.* —— *Oh crafty Imposture*, says he, *of the evil Spirit!*

Year after the Apostles 260.

*Spirit! He is indeed Darkness, yet he counterfeits Light. When he does not prevail by open War, he lays his Snares. When he cannot bring thee to despise Baptism, he would cheat thee of it by overmuch Caution,* &c. ——— *He sets on all Ages, and must be resisted in all. Art thou a Youth? fight against Pleasures and Passions with this Auxiliary Strength: lift thy self in God's Army,* &c. ——— *Art thou old? let thy gray Hairs hasten thee: strengthen thy old Age with Baptism.* &c. ——— Νήπιόν ἐςι σοὶ; μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἡ κακία ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθήτω, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιερωθήτω τῷ Πνεύματι. Σὺ δὲ δείδοικας τὴν σφραγῖδα διὰ τὸ φύσεως ἀσθενὲς, ὡς μικρόψυχος ἡ μήτηρ καὶ ὀλιγόπιστος. ἡ Ἄννα δὲ καὶ πρὶν ἢ γεννηθῆναι τὸν Σαμουὴλ καθυπέσχετο τῷ Θεῷ. καὶ γεννηθέντα ἱερῶν ἐνθὺς ποιεῖ, καὶ τῇ ἱερατικῇ στολῇ συνανέθρεψεν ἐ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον φοβηθεῖσα, τῷ δὲ Θεῷ πιςεύσασα.

§. 4.

*Hast thou an Infant-Child? Let not Wickedness have the Advantage of time: Let him be sanctified from his Infancy: Let him be dedicated from his Cradle to* [or, by] *the Spirit. Thou, as a faint-hearted Mother and of little Faith, art afraid of giving him the Seal because of the Weakness of Nature.* Hannah *before* Samuel *was born, devoted him to God, and assoon as he was born, consecrated him, and brought him up from the first in a priestly Garment, not fearing for humane Infirmities, but trusting in God. Thou hast no need of Amulets or Charms; together with which the Devil slides into the Minds of shallow Persons, drawing to himself the Veneration that is due to God.* Δὸς αὐτῷ τὴν τριάδα, τὸ μέγα καὶ καλὸν φυλακτήριον. *Give to him the Trinity, that great and excellent Preservative.*

He proceeds to stir up all Persons in all Estates and Employments to receive Baptism: only he would advise those that had places at Court, to resign and *fly from Sodom,* if conveniently they could, when they were baptized: (It is to be noted that *Valens* a wicked and *Arian* Emperour reigned at that time.) If they could not conveniently, yet to be baptiz'd, and preserve the Purity thereof as well as they could in so ill a Station: that God in judging of our Lives makes Allowance for the Circumstances that we are in: *that for a Man that is fetter'd to get forward a little, is as great Praise as for another to run: for one that travels in a dirty Road to be but a little bespatter'd, is more remarkable than for another to be clean.*

§. 5. He next sets upon those Men that put off their Baptism to Death or Old-Age for the love of their sinful Pleasures which they were unwilling as yet to part with: who said, *where is the Advantage of taking Baptism*

*tism so soon, and thereby cutting ones self off from all the worldly Pleasures and Delights? Whereas one may enjoy these Pleasures in the mean while, and then be baptiz'd at last. For they that went the earliest to labour in the Vineyard sped no better than they that came in the latest.* Year after the Apostles 260.

He answers; *You have saved me a great deal of Trouble by your making this Plea: for you have at last with much ado discover'd the very Secret of this Delay. And tho' I dislike your wicked purpose, yet I commend you for one thing, that you own it without Disguise.*

*Come on then, and give the Sense of this Parable: and be not ignorantly scandaliz'd* [or drawn into Sin] *by this place of Scripture.*

*First, This is not meant of Baptism, but of those who come, some sooner, some later, to the Faith* [or the Knowledge of Christian Religion] *and enter the Vineyard, the Church: for every one must labour from that Day and Hour on which he comes to the Faith,* &c.

*Besides, supposing by entring the Vineyard Baptism be meant: the Parable shews that those that do at all enter the Vineyard and labour, shall have a Reward. But you are in Danger to miss of doing that, if you were sure that notwithstanding this wicked Contrivance to avoid labouring, you should at last obtain Baptism, you might be pardon'd in this sordid Cunning: But since there is Danger, that while you take this Advantage, you will quite miss of the Vineyard,* &c. *take my Counsel, lay aside these Subtilties, and come with an honest Mind to Baptism; lest you be taken out of this Life before you attain your Purpose, and be found to have devis'd these Fallacies to your own Destruction.*

*But you will say,* 'Is not God merciful enough to take 'in such a Case the Desire of Baptism for Baptism?

§. 6. *You would have us believe a monstrous thing, if you think that God, because he is merciful, will count him inlightned that is not, and take him into the Kingdom of Heaven that wishes for it, but does not perform the things that make the way to it. I will tell you what is my Opinion of this Matter, in which, I believe, considering Men will agree with me.*

*As there are several sorts of those who do obtain the Gift of Baptism some were before extremely wicked,* &c. *Others,* &c. ——— *So it is likewise in those who miss of Baptism, For some of 'em live like Beasts, and regard not Baptism,* &c. *Some have a value for Baptism, but delay the receiving of it, either out of Negligence, or* δι' ἀπλησίαν *out*

of

Year after the Apostles 260.

*of Greedineß longer to enjoy their Lusts:* Οἱ δὲ δὲ εἰσὶν οὐ δυνάμει τοῦ δέξασθαι, ἢ διὰ νηπιότητα τυχὸν, ἢ τινα τελέως ἀκούσιον περιπέτειαν, ἐξ ὧν δὲ βουλομένοις αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχει τυχεῖν τοῦ χαρίσματος. *But some others have it not in their own Power to receive it, either because of their* Infancy *perhaps, or by reason of some Accident utterly involuntary, so that tho' they desire it, they have no Opportunity to obtain the Gift. As therefore we found much difference among those* [that do obtain Baptism] *so there is among those* [that miss of it.]

*They that wholly scorn it, are worse than the negligent or those that crave longer time. But these are worse than those who fail of the Gift* ἐξ ἀγνοίας ἢ τυραννίδος *by Ignorance or Constraint:* Τυραννὶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ ἀκούσιος διαμαρτία, *for Constraint is no other thing than to miß against ones Will.*

*And I think of the first sort, that they shall be punish'd as for their other Wickedneß, so for their slighting of Baptism. And that the second shall be punish'd, but in a leß degree, because they are guilty of their own missing it, but rather thro' Folly than Malice.* Τοὺς δὲ μετὰ δόξαν ἀπιστοῦντας μᾶλλον κολασθήσεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δικαίου Κριτοῦ, ὡς ἀσφραγίστους μὲν ἀπολήψεσθε δὲ, ἀλλὰ παθόντας μᾶλλον τὴν ζημίαν ἢ δράσαντας: *but that the last sort will neither be glorified nor punished by the just Judge; as being without the Seal, but not thro' their own Wickedneß; and as having suffer'd the loß rather than occasioned it.*

*For he that is not worthy of Punishment, is not therefore presently worthy of Honour; as he that is not worthy of Honour, does not therefore deserve Punishment.*

*And I think thus also, If you would condemn for Murder, a Man that has not murdered, merely because he had a Mind so to do; then let him go with you for a baptized Person, who had a Mind to it but had it not. But if that be absurd, I don't see how this can be reasonable.*

*Or if you please, take it thus: If to obtain the Effect of Baptism you think it sufficient that you desired Baptism, and thereupon claim the Glory of Heaven; let the Desire of that Glory suffice you instead of the Glory it self: for what matter is it if you go without it, so long as you have the Desire of it.*

He next blames those that pretended they would stay till *Epiphany* or *Easter*, or *Whitsuntide*, and then be baptiz'd. *What will come of this?* says he, *the end of your Life will come on a sudden, in a Day and Hour that you think not of*, &c.

Those that would stay for the Presence of their Friends and Relations, or till they had got ready an *Offering* for the

the Church, or a *Present* for the Baptizer, or a handsome *White-Garment*, or Provision for a *Treat*, he chides in these Words; *These things I warrant you are mighty necessary: and the Grace of Baptism will be e're the less for want of these. In things of great Consequence don't stand upon trifling Matters. This Sacrament is of higher Concern*, &c. *For an* Offering, *give* your self. Put on *Christ*. Treat me *with your commendable Life. God values nothing but those things which the Poor have to give as well as the Rich*, &c.

Year after the Apostles 260.

'Tis in like manner that he reproves such as stood on heighth and punctilio's, that would have a Bishop or a Metropolitan, or the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, or (if it were a Priest) one that lead an unmarried Life, for their Baptizer: or that scorn'd to be baptiz'd together with a poor Man: or counted the length of the *Service* too tedious.

He tells 'em the most acceptable Posture or Preparation to receive it, is a Heart inflamed with the Desire of it: that God takes that for a Kindness, if we be earnestly desirous of his Kindnesses: he takes more Pleasure in giving than others in receiving, *&c.*

§. 7. He concludes that Paragraph with saying, *We must therefore make it our utmost Care that we do not miss of the common Grace:* and then follow these Words, Ἔστω ταῦτα, φησὶ πρὸς τοὺς ὀπτζηταίνων τὸ βάπτισμα· τί δ' ἂν εἴποις πρὸς τοὺς ἔτι νηπίους, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαισθανομένους, μήτε τῆς χάριτος; ἢ καὶ ταῦτα βαπτίσομεν; πάνυγε, εἴπερ τις ἐπείγει κίνδυνος. Κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἀναισθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἐπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα, καὶ ἀτέλεστα. καὶ τάχα λόγος ἡμῖν ἡ ὀκλαήμερος πρεπτομὴ, τυπική τις ἔσται σφραγὶς, καὶ ἀλογίστοις ἔτι πρασαγορευομένη: ὡς δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν φιλῶν χεῖρας διὰ τῶν ἀναισθήτων φυλάττεται τὰ πρωτότοκα. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων διδόμεν γνώμην, τὴν τελείαν ἀναμένοντας, ἢ μικρὸν ὕστερον τούτου, ἢ ὑπὲρ τούτου, ἡνίκα καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τι μυστικὸν καὶ ὑποκρίνεσθαι δύνασθαι, εἰ καὶ μὴ συνίασι τελείως, ἀλλ' ἓν τυπούμενοι, ἵνα ἁγιάζειν καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τῆς τελειώσεως. *Some may say, suppose this to hold in the Case of those that can desire Baptism: What say you to those that are as yet Infants, and are not in Capacity to be sensible either of the Grace or the Miss of it? Shall we baptize them too? Yes, by all means, if any Danger make it requisite. For it is better that they be* sanctified *without their own sense of it, than that they should dy* unsealed *and* uninitiated. And a ground of this to us is Circumcision, *which was given on the eighth Day, and was a typical* Seal [or Baptism] *and was practis'd on those that had no use of Reason: As also the anointing of the Door-Posts, which preserved the First-born by things that have no Sense. As for*

*others*

Year after the Apostles 260.

*others, I give* my Opinion *that they should stay three Years or thereabouts, when they are capable to hear and answer some of the holy Words; and tho' they do not perfectly understand 'em, yet they form 'em: and that you then* sanctifie *'em in Soul and Body with the great Sacrament of Initiation. For tho' they are not liable to give account of their Life before their Reason be come to Maturity (they having this Advantage by their Age, that they are not forced to account for the Faults they have committed in Ignorance? Ἀλλὰ τοῦ λόγου παντὶ λόγῳ λυσιτελέστερον διὰ τὰς ἐξαίφνης συμπεσούσας ἡμῖν περιβολὰς τῶν κινδύνων, καὶ βοηθείας ἀχρειείας, yet by reason of those sudden and unexpected Assaults of Dangers that are by no Endeavour to be prevented, it is by all means advisable that they be secur'd by the Laver* [of Baptism].

Then he answers the Objection or Pretence which some made from our Saviour's being 30 Year old before he was baptiz'd, shewing the Disparity in a great many Particulars: one is this, that there was no Danger in his delaying, who needed no Purgation: and besides had the time of his Death *as well as of his Birth* at his own Disposal. *But to you*, says he, *there is a great deal of Danger, if you should depart this Life, having been begotten in Corruption, and not being clothed with Incorruption and Immortality.*

§. 8. The rest of the Sermon is spent, partly in teaching 'em how to prepare themselves, *viz.* by Fasting, Watching, Prayer, Alms-deeds, Restitution of Goods ill gotten in the time of their Heathenism (for, he says, tho' in Baptism they are pardon'd all past Sins, yet he that keeps in his Hands, after Baptism, any thing that is in Justice due to another, continues in the Sin: to keep it is a present Sin, tho' the Act of Stealing it be a past one.) And partly in charging on their Consciences the Necessity of keeping their Baptismal Vow, when they have made it: in shewing the wretched Estate from which they are deliver'd, the happy one into which they are going to be enter'd, and the dreadful one into which they will fall if they revolt. And partly, in explaining the Creed and Faith into which they are baptized; where he especially insists on the Belief of the *Holy Trinity* (for these were times in which the *Arian* Heresie was rife) of which having spoken largely, and answer'd the Charge of *Tritheism* cast on the Catholicks, and other Objections of the *Arians*, he declares he will baptize none of 'em that do not own this Faith. *And if you do still halt*, says he,

he, *and do not own the Divinity full and perfect, seek for some body else to baptize* [or dip] *you, or rather drown* [or destroy] *you: for I have no mind to divide the Deity, and at the time of your new Birth to bring Death on you; so that you will have neither Baptism, nor the hope of the Grace, your Salvation being quickly shipwreckt. For if you deny Divinity to any of these three, you overthrow the whole* [Trinity] *and make your Baptism of no force* [or benefit] *to you.* Year after the Apostles 260.

He concludes with giving the Meaning of some Ceremonies then used at Baptism: particularly of the *Lamps* they lighted and held in their Hands, denoting those of the wise Virgins that were prepared to meet their Lord: of which Parable he makes a godly Application to 'em.

§. 9. Among the things that we are to observe from this Oration, this ought to be one:

1. The foul Imposture that *Grotius* was guilty of when he went (3) about to disprove the ancient Practice of Infant-Baptism from this very Sermon, in which there is nothing more or otherwise said of that matter than I have recited. He takes a few Words out of this Discourse, and even out of one of the Passages here (4) recited, where *Gregory* speaks of some, *οἱ οὐδὲ εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τῶν δεξάντων, διὰ νηπιότητα τύχοι, ἤ τινα τελέως ἀκούσιον περιπίτειαν, who have not the receiving of Baptism in their own Power, either for their Infancy perhaps, or by reason of some accident utterly involuntary*, of whom 'tis said a little after, that they lose the Kingdom of Heaven by so dying unbaptized, but yet escape Punishment, because it was not their Fault. He takes out of these Words, the Words *διὰ νηπιότητα* by themselves, and makes this use of 'em; that *Gregory's* mentioning some *that are not baptiz'd διὰ νηπιότητα by reason of their Infancy*, imports that Infants were not wont to be baptiz'd.

(3) Annot. in Mat. 19. 14.

(4) supra §. 6.

A great Stock of Learning does not always cure that Narrowness of Soul by which some people are inclin'd to do any mean and foul thing to favour a Side or set up a Party. There is no mincing this Matter by supposing it to have been a Mistake. The altering and total perverting of the Sence is so plain, that no Man that had read the Sermon, or even but that Passage it self, could mistake it, much less could he.

§. 10. 2. It appears most evidently by the Tenor of this Sermon that *Nazianzen* held concerning Baptism these Tenets;

Year after the Apostles 260.

1. That all who died unbaptized by their own Fault or Negligence, were condemned.
2. He thought that Infants dying unbaptiz'd, and adult Persons who mist of Baptism by some unavoidable Impediment, and not by their own Fault, were in a kind of middle State between Happiness and Torment. But that baptized Infants were Partakers of the Kingdom of Heaven.
3. Where there is no Danger of an Infants Death, he has a particular Opinion (which he accordingly expresses (5) thus, δίδωμι γνώμην, *I give my Opinion*) that his Baptism should be delayed till he is three Years old: which would please neither the Pædobaptist nor Antipædobaptist.

(5) Supra §. 7.

He seems to have taken up this Opinion in some degree of Complyance with his Father's Practice, who probably had kept him unbaptiz'd so long purposely, and then seeing no Danger of Death delayed it farther from time to time.

This Man and *Tertullian* are the only two that speak of delaying it at all: one, till the Age of Reason; the other, till three Years. Both one and the other, are to be understood, where there is no Danger of Death in the mean while: which is plainly expressed (6) here, and in *Tertullian* is collected from his other Speeches.

(6) §. 7.

§. 11. 3. He uses three or four times in this Oration (as he does also frequently in his other Works) the Word [ἁγιασθῆναι *to be sanctified*, or *made holy*] for Baptism. And so did St. *Cyprian* in his Words before (7) cited, and other places: and so do the Ancients generally. Mr. *Walker* (8) has taken the Pains to produce Quotations out of almost all the ancient Writers to shew that this was a common Phrase with them, to say, an Infant or other Person *sanctified*, when they mean baptized: and I do for Brevity's sake, refer the Reader to his Book. The Scripture also uses it so, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Eph.* 5. 26.

(7) CH. VI. §. 1.

(8) Modest Plea for Inf. Baptism Chap. 29.

Which makes that Explication of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Now are your Children Holy*, which is given by *Tertullian*, St. *Austin*, St. *Hierom*, *Paulinus*, *Pelagius*, (9) and other Ancients; and since by Dr. *Hammond*, (10) Mr. *Walker*, (11) &c. much the more probable; whereby they make the Words ἅγια *holy*, and ἡγίασται *has been sanctified*, to refer to Baptism.

(9) See CH. 19. §. 19.

(10) Six Queries.

(11) Modest Plea.

And their Explication is also the more probable, because there has no other Sense of those Words been yet given

given by Expositors but what is liable to much Contest: but especially that Sense which some Antipædobaptists have endeavour'd to affix to 'em (of legitimacy in Opposition to Bastardy) seems the most forc'd and far fetch'd of all. Year after the Apostles 260.

The Words are, Ἡγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ, καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ ἅγιά ἐστιν. The grammatical Translation of which Words is, *For the unbelieving Husband* [or an unbelieving Husband] *has been sanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife,* [or an unbelieving Wife] *has been sanctified by the Husband. Else your Children would be unclean: but now they are holy.* Our Translators alter'd the Tense, and put [*is sanctified*] instead of [*has been sanctified*] because they thought, it seems, the Sense required it: But without any such Alteration, the Paraphrase given by many learned Men is to this purpose;

For it has ordinarily come to pass, that an unbelieving Husband has been brought to the Faith and so to Baptism, by his Wife: and likewise an unbelieving Wife by her Husband. If it were not so; and if the Wickedness or Infidelity of the unbelieving Party did usually prevail, the Children of such would be generally kept unbaptized and so be unclean. But now we see, by the Grace of God, a contrary Effect, for they are generally baptiz'd, and so become holy, or sanctified.

If the Reader will turn back to *CH. IV.* §. 12. and also compare the Quotations I shall produce in *Ch. XV.* §. 2. and *CH. XVIII.* §. 4. and *CH. XIX.* §. 19. of this Book, he will see that St. *Austin's* and *Pelagius's* Comment on those Words of the Apostle is exactly to this purpose: and that *Tertullian* differs from them only in this, that he expounds the Holiness that such Children have by the Prerogative of their Birth, by these Words, *Sanctitati designati*, designed for Holiness, because he reckons and proves from Scripture, that they cannot be actually holy till they are actually baptiz'd: and that St. *Hierom* and *Paulinus* speak to the same Effect.

The Word Ἅγιοι in the New-Testament is translated sometimes *Saints*, sometimes *Holy* Persons, and was in the same use with them as the Word *Christians* is with us.

There are two things, beside what I have mention'd, that do make this Sense the more natural to that place. One is, that it appears by the Apostle's other Words in the Context, that this was his Scope of arguing. *For*

Year after the Apostles 260.

*what knowest thou, O Wife,* says he, *whether thou shalt save thy Husband?* i. e. by bringing him over to the Faith: *Or how knowest thou, O Man, whether thou shalt save thy Wife?* This is a very different Aim from what he would have, if he meant only that an unbelieving Wife is sanctified to a Believer for the use of the Bed, as unclean Meats are to a faithful Eater.

Another is, that the Custom of the *Jewish* Language had made it ordinary before the Apostles time to use the Word [*to sanctifie*] for baptizing or washing. Where God commands *Moses* at the giving of the Law, *Exod.* 19. 10. *Sanctific them to day and to Morrow*; all the learned *Jews* understand it, that he bid him baptize, *i. e.* wash 'em. And they prove from this place that *Israel* enter'd into Covenant by Baptism as well as Circumcision. Most of the Orders to the Priests and Levites to sanctifie themselves, are explain'd by washing themselves. Where 'tis said, *Levit.* 6. 27. *All that touches the Flesh of the Sin-Offering, shall be holy,* the original Word is *shall be sanctified:* that is, (as the following Verses shew) shall be washed. In 2 *Sam.* 11. 4. 'tis said. *Bathsheba was then purified* (in the original *was sanctified*) *from her Uncleanness:* and this was done by washing. The *divers Washings* among the *Jews*, mention'd *Heb.* 9. 10. (where 'tis in the original, *divers Baptisms*) are frequently styl'd by the *Jews* in their Writings, *Sanctifications:* as the Priest's washing his Hands and Feet ten times on the Day of Atonement, is called by them *the ten Sanctifications.* This is so fully cleared by *Ainsworth*, *Lightfoot*, *Hammond*, &c. that there need no more be said of it.

(12) Quæst. 84.

St. *Austin* in his *Questions on Leviticus* has this (12) Enquiry; how it is meant that *Moses* should *sanctify the High-Priest*, Levit. 21. 8. when God says, *ver.* 15. *I the Lord do sanctify him?* In answer to which he distinguishes between the *visible Sanctification* and the *invisible:* and after some Discourse that the invisible is the chief, but yet that the other is not to be neglected, says, *Hence* Cornelius *and they that were with him, when they appeared to be already sanctified invisibly by the Holy Ghost coming on them, were for all that baptized: nor was the* visible Sanctification *counted needless because the invisible was before.*

St. *Paul* inscribes his Epistles sent to the *Christians* of any places, thus, τοῖς ἁγίοις *to the* holy *Persons*; or thus, τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις *to such as have been sanctified* at such or such a place. And so the Inscription of his Letter to the *Corinthian*

*rinthian* Christians in these (13) Words, *Unto the Church of God which is at* Corinth, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις: *to those that are sanctified* [or have been sanctified] *in Christ* Jesus, *called to be* Saints: 'tis but a larger Periphrasis of what one would have said; *to all that are* Christians *there.* And St. *Chrysostom* in his Comment on these very Words puts the Question, τί δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἁγιασμός; *What is the Sanctification he speaks of?* and answers readily, τὸ λουτρὸν, ὁ καθαρισμὸς, *the Laver,* their Baptism, *their cleansing.*

Year after the Apostles 260.

(13) 1 Cor. 1. 2.

The ancient Church likewise that compil'd the Apostles Creed, when they would declare it as an Article of Christian Religion, that all Christians ought to hold Communion with one another, express that Article thus, *The Communion* τῶν ἁγίων *of Saints.*

Therefore when St. *Paul* in this place uses the very same Word, and says, *else your Children would be unclean: but now they are* ἅγια (which Word is rendred in *English* sometimes *Saints,* sometimes *Holy,*) 'tis not at all alien to his ordinary use of the Word to understand it, Else your Children would be kept unbaptized, unsanctified, unchristian, unholy, or unclean: but now they are generally sanctified by Baptism, and become holy or Christians. If we had lived in the times of the Ancients, when the Word *sanctified* was us'd in common Speech for *baptized,* this would have seem'd a natural Interpretation.

This Exposition, as it avoids on one side the Inconveniency of that given by the Antipædobaptists, which takes the Word [holy] and [unclean] in a Sense in which they are never used in Scripture: so it is likewise free from the Exceptions which lie against that which limits the Baptism of Children so absolutely to that Condition of their being born of believing Parents; that it leads the Baptizer into many perplexing Scruples, whose Children he may baptize, and whose not. As the late Bishop of *Worcester* has largely (14) shewn.

(14) Unreasonableness of Separation Part III. §. 36.

24. What St. *Gregory* here says in the last place, that he will baptize no *Arian,* nor any that disowns the Godhead of Christ and the Trinity, is according to the general Sense of the Catholicks of that, and of the foregoing times. They would not hold Communion with the *Arians,* and consequently would not by Baptism enter such as Members into their Church. The greatest Persecutions that the Catholicks at any time suffer'd, were on this Account. For the *Arian* Emperors seldom went so far as to force the Bishops to renounce the Catholick

Year after the Apostles 260. Faith and turn *Arians*: But they would banish 'em, unless they would receive the *Arians* to Communion, or join with them. It was upon this Account that *Athanasius* (who flourished from the Beginning to almost the end of the *Arian* Controversie) did so often suffer Exile; 240. because he would not admit *Arius* or his Followers to Communion, when it was desir'd by *Constantine* (who sought herein the Quietness of his own Government) and the other Emperors that were themselves *Arians*.

These Ancients reckon'd that Christians might and ought to hold Communion notwithstanding difference of Opinions in lesser Matters: but that this was a Fundamental one, as relating to that which is the direct Object of our Worship.

The *Arians* for this reason made a great many Attempts to express their Faith in such ambiguous Terms as might seem to agree with the Catholick sense. It is 250. a Wonder to see in (15) *Socrates* and other Church Historians how many Creeds were set forth for this purpose as Schemes of Agreement between the two Parties. Some of these served in some Churches to patch up for a while an unsound Union; which was broken to pieces again as soon as each Party express'd their Meaning in other Words. And it was found at last by a long Trial that there was no firm Agreement to be had but by owning the Terms of the *Nicene Creed*. Mr. *le Clerc* observes somewhere that the major part of the Councils in those times, and of the Creeds drawn up in them, were on the *Arian* side. No Body need envy 'em this Advantage: for we are not for a Number of Creeds. The Catholicks adher'd to the *Nicene*, and were for having no more than that: it was the *Arian* Party, which not agreeing among themselves, multiplied several Draughts of Faith. The *Nicene* Creed was at last found to be the only Test to distinguish a Catholick from an *Arian*.

(15) Hist. l. 2.

This I observe on account of some modern *Arians*: or rather they are to be called *Photinians*; for they have much more dishonourable Opinions of our Saviour Christ than the *Arians* had, and are more in the Sentiments of *Photinus*, who was in the *Arian* times condemned (16) both by the *Catholicks* and the *Arians*.

(16) Socrat. lib. 2. c. 29.

There are of 'em both among the Pædobaptists and the Antipædobaptists. Whether the Antipædobaptists, that believe in the Trinity, do baptize and receive into Communion any such, or not, I am not sure. It is not likely

likely that they who do separate from one another for far lesser Differences, will dispense with so great a one about the Divinity of Christ.

Year after the Apostles 260.

But those Antitrinitarians, that are Pædobaptists, in *England*, have of late, on a sudden, declared themselves to be at Unity with the Catholick Church: yet the Account which they give of their Conversion to a good Opinion of the Catholick Faith, is the oddest one that was ever given in so serious a Matter. One does not know whether they are in earnest, or whether they mock in speaking of that awful Mystery. About the Year 1697 they published a Paper which they called *The Agreement between the* Unitarians *and the* Catholick *Church*: drawn up by themselves, and whether approved by any other I know not. In a Book publish'd next Year, which gives an account of *The Life of* Thomas Firmin, *and of his Religion*, they recite the said *Agreement*, and discourse something more on the subject matter of it. In *the Account of his Religion*, after having observ'd that People had once thought that the difference between the *Unitarians* and the Catholick Church was *real, great, and even unreconcilable*, they add (17)

(17) pag. 5.

'*But the Unitarians* (*or Socinians*) *being Men of ingenuous and free Minds and Principles, and therefore always ready to entertain farther Light; after* 8 *or* 9 *Years late Contest in print with the principal Divines of this Nation, have been so dextrous and happy, that instead of farther embroyling the Points in Question, which is the usual Effect of the Paper War, they seem to have accommodated whatsoever Differences between the Church and them.* And a little after.

*Other Sects by the Favour of Princes, or the Quality of the Times, have obtained an Exemption from Mulcts and Penalties*, &c. — *If* Socinianism *had any were enjoyed those* Halcyon *Days, it's sudden irresistible Progress would have been as lightning*, which rushes out of the East and shines even to the West. *Alas! on equal ground and with equal Circumstances the Combat between unintelligible Mystery and clear Reason; between seeming Contradictions, Absurdities, and Impossibilities, and a rational, obvious, accountable Faith, would soon have been ended. But it is better ended: the Divine Providence and Goodness, in Mercy to both Parties, has granted a Peace instead of a Victory. It has pleas'd God to favour the suffering side with an unexpected Light: He has shewn 'em* (*what may seem incredible*)

Year after the Apostles 260. *dible) that their Opposers think as they [the Unitarians] speak, that their Difference is not in the Idea's or Notions, but only in the Terms or Words. To manifest this, Mr.* Firmin *caused the following Scheme of Agreement*, &c.

And to this purpose in the other Treatise of the said Book, *viz.* in the *Life of Mr. Firmin*, they say, (18)

(18) pag. 18.

*The Unitarians never intended to oppose any other Trinity, but a Trinity of Minds or Spirits. Grant to 'em that GOD is one infinite Spirit or Mind, not two or three, they demand no more. They applied themselves therefore to enquire which of these Trinities, a Trinity of Spirit, or of Properties, is the Doctrine of the Catholick Church. They could not miss of a ready Satisfaction: all Systems Catechisms, Books of Controversie, Councils, Writers that have been esteemed Catholick, ——— have defined God to be one Infinite, All-perfect Spirit: and the Divine Persons to be nothing else but the Divine Essence or Godhead, with the three relative Properties, Unbegotten, Begotten, Proceeding.*

'Tis a Wonder then that these Men could never perceive this before. Had they never look'd into any System, Catechism, Council, *&c.* before the Year 1697? they say themselves, that assoon as they set themselves to enquire, they could not miss of a ready Satisfaction. They would seem to insinuate that a late Book, which asserted *three infinite Minds* in the Deity, had given 'em that Offence which they conceived against the Church: but this is malicious and impossible to be true: for, besides that it was but one Man's way of expressing himself, they had set up a Party here, and broacht their Opinions a good while before that: and the writing of that Book was occasion'd by a just Zeal against their blasphemous *Notes on* Athanasius's *Creed* published before.

But since they do now make a Proposal of coming into the Communion of the Church; it is not so material to enquire what was the occasion of their Quarrel, as it is to know whether their Return to the Church be cordial, and whether they are as yet of such a Faith, as that, according to this Rule of St. *Gregory*, they ought to be admitted to Baptism (those of them that are not yet baptiz'd) or to the Communion.

§. 13. 1. And if they would be received as cordially joining with the Catholicks, why do they still speak of the Divinity of Christ in so ambiguous Terms as becomes not such as have lain under Censure of false Doctrine in

that

that point? They (19) repeat out of their Scheme; *We say our Lord Christ is God and Man. He is Man in respect of his reasonable Soul and humane Body; God in respect of* God in him: *or more scholastically, in respect of the* Hypostatical *or* Personal *Union of the Humanity of Christ with the Divinity, By which the Catholick Church means, and we mean; The Divinity was not only occasionally assisting to, but was, and is always in Christ; illuminating, conducting,* &c. And again (20)

Year after the Apostles 260.

(19) Account of *Firmin's* Religion p. 18.

*Nor do we reckon of the Lord Christ as* but a Creature. *I have said before, he is God and Man. The Divinity did so* inhabit *in the Humanity of Christ, doth so exert in it the most glorious Effects of Omnipotence and Omniscience, that if others have been called God because they* represented *God, Christ is to be so called because he* exhibits *God.*

(20) Pag. 30.

All this, except what they say of the Personal Union, is lame still. For another Man, as for Example *Moses*, or any Prophet that had the Spirit of God in him, illuminating, conducting, and enabling him to work miracles, *&c.* might be said to *exhibit* God in this Sense; only not in so high a degree, or not always.

What they subscribe to of the *Hypostatical* or *Personal* Union would indeed be firm, and for ever stop their way against returning to *Socinianism*, if they had express'd it *scholastically* as they pretend to do. I mean, if they had said this Union to be *of the Humanity of Christ with the* λόγε, *or second of the three Persons.* But when they say, *with the Divinity*, they either do not understand the Import of that Phrase, of Hypostatical or Personal Union; or else they purposely confound the Notion. They don't mean sure, that the Humanity of Christ is personally united to, or makes one Person with, the Father.

The very Doctrine for which both *Paulus Samosatenus* and *Photinus* were condemned by the Church, was that they made Christ to be God only by the *Inhabitation* of God in him: as Bp. *Stillingfleet* had (21) fully proved to them. And yet if you mind these Mens Phrases, they own no More: and even the *Hypostatical Union* they explain to mean no more, and do without any Modesty say, that the Church means no more by it.

160. 244.

(21) Vindication of Trinity. c. 4.

§. 14. The Truth is, the *Socinians* have very lately made a great and monstrous Change in their Doctrine: and yet hold their main Article still; That Christ has, properly speaking, no Nature but the humane: and these *English Unitarians* do by their way of explaining themselves

Year after the Apostles 260.

ſelves give ground to ſuſpect that they are ſtill in that Sentiment. They were wont formerly to degrade that λόγος of which St. *John* ſpeaks, as much as they could; making it to be nothing but the humane Nature of *Jeſus* Chriſt, or ſomething belonging to the humane Nature. They did uſe to expound thus; *In the Beginning was the Word*, i. e. In the Beginning of the Goſpel, *Jeſus* Chriſt and his preaching was. *And the Word was with God:* i. e. He and his preaching were appointed in the Counſel of God. *And the Word was God*: i. e. He was God's Deputy toMen. *All things were made by him*: i. e. All Matters of the Goſpel Diſpenſation were done by him, *&c.*

But now of late they put a Notion on the Term λόγος, which carries the utmoſt degree of Contrariety to their former Interpretation. They make the λόγος to be not at all diſtinct from God the Father, neither in Nature nor in Perſon: but to be his Attribute of Wiſdom, Reaſon, *&c.* Thus a certain Writer over the Water, whoſe Works they greedily tranſlate into *Engliſh*;

*In the Beginning was the Word*: i. e. In the Beginning was Reaſon.

*And the Word was with God*: i. e. And that Reaſon was with God.

*And the Word was God*: i. e. And God was that Reaſon.

*The ſame was in the Beginning with God*: i. e. There was, I ſay, Reaſon in God before the World was created. Are not theſe great Apophthegms for St. *John* to ſay?

And in the following Verſes wherever we read *He* or *Him*, they tranſlate it. *All things were made by* It: *and without* It *was not any thing, &c.* And then *ver.* 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh*: i. e. And this Reaſon, by the Man in whom it was, was made conſpicuous.

And where the Author to the *Hebrews* having expreſly named *God's Son, whom he has appointed Heir of all things*, adds theſe Words; *by whom alſo he made the Worlds*: becauſe here is no poſſible turning *Him* into *It*, the Paraphraſe is; *that is, having heretofore by that* λόγος *or Reaſon, or eternal Wiſdom which reſided in* Jeſus, *and was moſt nearly united to him, created all things.* If by *moſt nearly united* be meant ſo united as to become one Perſon, it is Catholick. But the terms of *reſiding in him*, and of being *made conſpicuous by him*, expreſs a more lax ſort of Union than what the Words of Scripture do every where ſet forth. And at ſuch a rate of interpreting it might be ſaid of any meer Man, in whom the Spirit of God does re-

ſide,

side, that *the World was made by him*: because he has in him that Spirit by which it was made. But the Scripture is far from saying so of any meer Man; and of our Lord *Jesus* Christ it never speaks otherwise than so: (22) *By* Him *were all things created*: *and* He *is before all things*. (23) *Of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ came*, Who *is over all*, &c. *With the Glory* (24) *which* I *had with thee before the World was*. I (25) *came forth from the Father*. *Before* Abraham *was*, I *am* [or was] *&c.* 'Tis not said, the Spirit or Wisdom which is in me, came forth from the Father, or had Glory with thee: but *I* came forth. *I* had Glory, *&c.* And as far as the personal Word *I* or *He* can denote the same Person, it is here and every where else denoted.

Year after the Apostles 260.

(22) Col. 1. 16, 17.
(23) Rom. 9. 5.
(24) John 17. 5.
(25) John 16. 28.

The *Paulianists* and *Photinians* would say, as these Men do, that Christ is God and Man: but if they were ask'd whether he was God first, or Man first; they would say, he was Man first, and afterwards God, by God's dwelling in him. And these Men seem to mean no other. But the Catholick Church believes that he was God first, and afterward became Man. As St. *John* tells first what he was originally: and then how he was made Flesh.

*Cerinthus*, who was St. *John's* chief Adversary, and against whom he had a particular Eye, when he wrote his Gospel (as both (26) *Irenæus* and St. (27) *Hierom* do witness) taught *that* Jesus *was the Son of* Joseph *and* Mary *in like manner as all other Men: and that he was eminent for Justice, Prudence and Wisdom, above all others: and that after his Baptism* Christ *came down upon him from the supreme Power in the Shape of a Dove*, &c. This was *Cerinthus's* Doctrine, as (28) *Irenæus* repeats it, who lived so nigh those times that he may well be thought to be born in the time of *Cerinthus*. And this is the same for substance with the latter of those two sorts of *Socinianism* that I mention'd; only it was by him blundringly express'd: that which they style λόγος he calls *Christ*, and he does not allow him to be born of a Virgin. They must be *dextrous and happy Men* indeed, that can reconcile St. *John's* Gospel to that very Sense against which it was purposely written.

(26) lib. 3. c. 11.
(27. de script. Eccl. v. Joannes.
(28) lib. 1. c. 25.

This *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, both whose Doctrine concerning our Lord was (as *Irenæus* in the (29) next Chapter testifies) the same, were the first *Socinians* in the World, except those mentioned *John* 6. 42. who said, *Is not this* Jesus *the Son of* Joseph, *whose Father and Mother*

(29) l. 1. c. 26.

Year after the Apostles 260.

*ther we know? How is it then that he says,* I came down from Heaven?

§. 15. 2. But besides, what Hopes can we have of any firm Union with these Men, who at the same time that they desire to be received into Communion with the Catholick Church, do set forth the Faith thereof in as ill Colours as possibly they can; calling it *unintelligible Mystery*, and their own *clear Reason*? That which we hold they describe as *seeming Impossibilities, Absurdities, and Contradictions*: theirs is a *rational, obvious, and accountable Faith.* And they express themselves as Men that were cock-sure, that if that Act of Parliament, which they call *a Bill in Name and Pretext against Immorality and Blasphemy, in truth and real Design against the Unitarians*, were taken out of the way, we should all presently turn *Socinians.* ('Tis to be noted that this *Act* came out much about the same time that they were *favour'd with* that *unexpected Light.*)

They ought not to be so hasty: there is another Book in the way, and that is the Scriptures. If they were abolished, and other Records of the Church with them, we freely grant that we should not naturally have any Notion of a Trinity, of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in one Godhead; nor should we ever have thought of being baptized in such a Name: nor have known of the *Word which was God, being made Flesh.* These Mysteries we grant would have been unintelligible.

But then there would have been another Inconveniency in that way of knowing God which they propose, *viz.* in entertaining only such Notions of him as we can form by natural Reason and *clear Idea's.* For some few Persons of more refined Intellectuals would conceive him to be a *spiritual Being* far above the Properties and Passions of Body and Matter. Others that could form no Notion of a Spirit, would say, This is *unintelligible Mystery:* we must have a God that has a Body, or else we shall think him to be nothing. These latter would be subdivided: for some would believe that he is made of a very fine, subtile, and etherial Matter, quite different from that which may be seen, or has any Limbs, *&c.* But others, and these the far greatest part of Mankind, would contend that a God that is suppos'd to see, and hear, and judge without any Ears or Eyes, is an *Absurdity, Impossibility, Contradiction*, a thing of which we can form no *clear Idea*: so they would have a God with Eyes and Ears as good as any Painter could make.

The

The Experience of all Ages of the World, ſhews that what I ſay is no Fancy but Matter of fact. This way therefore would not do, except they would join to it the Policy of the Papiſts, who do preſerve the true Notion of God, as he is ſet forth in Scripture, for the uſe of the learned and ſuch as they allow to read the Scripture; but keep at the ſame time wooden Gods for the uſe of the Mob. Year after the Apoſtles 260.

God Almighty give us all the Modeſty and Humility to think that his way of exiſting may well be ſuch as we cannot comprehend, any more than a Worm can comprehend what Reaſon, or Speech, or a Soul is: and quietly to acquieſce in that Account which he has been pleas'd to give of his own Nature, and of what we are to believe concerning him: and to take it according to the plain meaning of thoſe whom he has inſpir'd to write it: and to judge our ſelves, as we are indeed, far uncapable of explaining the manner of it; and much more uncapable of any Ability of trying and examining the Truth of it by our natural Idea's of the things themſelves. This laſt is impudent in thoſe who do own the Divine Inſpiration of the Writers.

§. 16. The great Progreſs which they boaſt they ſhould make, has no Example for their Encouragement in former Ages of the Church. *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* had ſome Followers: but that was before the Canon of Scripture, and particularly St. *John's* Goſpel was compleated and divulg'd: and it was moſtly in wild Countries, as (30) *Arabia deſerta*, &c. After the Writings of the Apoſtles were divulg'd, ſeveral ſingle Perſons, *Artemon*, *Theodotus*, *Paulus* of *Samoſata*, &c. attempted to ſet up ſuch a Sect, but never proſelyted any Region or City: and *Photinus*, tho' a very eloquent Man, and ſetting up in the *Arian* times, was preſently condemned by all Parties: So that *Epiphanius*, who wrote but 30 Years after that he began to vent his *Hereſy*, and before *Photinus* himſelf was dead, as it ſeems, tells him, (31) that *his Hereſie of all others was the eaſieſt to be confuted, not only by skilful Men, but by any that had any tolerable Underſtanding of the Senſe of Scripture.* And a little after. *The Hereſie of this Impoſtor is dwindled away, having laſted but a very little while*; and *Theodoret* ſays, (32) that *in his time it was quite forgot*: and ſo, he ſays, were *all the other Hereſies that had denied Chriſt's Divinity, Cerinthians, Ebionites, Sabellians*, &c. *ſo that the very Names of thoſe Sects were to many unknown.*

(30) Epiphan. in Hær. Ebionitarum. 80. 160. 245. 275.

(31) Hær. 71.

(32) Hæret. Fab. l. 2. c. ult.

And

Year after the Apostles, 260.

And whereas one (33) *Bonosus*, about, or a little after the time of *Photinus*, went about to vent the same Doctrine in *Dacia*; he was so far from having any Number of Followers, that he himself or his Name is hardly known in History: and *Theodoret* seems never to have heard of him.

(33) Mercator Differt. contra Anathematismos Nestorij. 522.

(34) Hær. 40.

*Mahomet* the Impostor arising in the foresaid *Arabia* (of which place (34) *Epiphanius* says, *it was the chief Nest of the* Ebionites *and* Nazarenes, *as I have*, says he, *often already observed*) was the only Man that after these times ventur'd to broach the Doctrine against Christ's Divinity: and he indeed with his Successors have converted a great part of the World *with a sudden irresistible Progress*: but then they have accordingly laid aside the Name of Christians, and disowned the Scriptures, as being plainly against 'em in this Matter, tho' they do believe Christ to have been a great Prophet.

Since that, in *Poland*, and such places bordering on the *Mahometans*, this Opinion has been entertained by some few as a middle sort of Religion between the *Christian* and *Mahometan*. And now of late it is come into *Holland*; and from thence into *England*, serving for the use of such as being stagger'd in their Faith by the Arguments of the *Deists*, which are rife in those Countries, yet will not go so far with them as to renounce *Jesus Christ* and the Scriptures, but take a middle way, holding with the Catholicks that he is a true Prophet, and the *Messiah* promised, and that he died and rose again, and will be our Judge; but with the *Deists* denying his Divinity, and holding that he had no Being before he was born or conceived in humane Flesh. They with the Catholicks say that the Scriptures are (originally and as they came out of the Apostles Hands) God's Word and not feigned by Men; but with the *Deists*, That what they say of Christ's Divinity, has been interpolated, or must be explain'd so as to fit with our natural Conceptions, which, they say, cannot admit the Notion of a Son of God that is properly one in Essence with the Father; nor of such a Son of God taking on him the humane Nature, when the Father does not. To believe such strange things on the Credit of Revelation, is, they say, to give great Advantage to the *Deists* who deny it all.

This Opinion, I say, never had any considerable Number of Followers in the World. The *Arian*, I grant, had: but that does not nigh so plainly contradict the Scriptures.

§. 17.

§. 17. Now to return to that which gave the occasion of this Digression: The Catholicks, as we see here by *Gregory Nazianzen*, would not baptize or receive to their Church an *Arian*, nor any one that did not profess Belief in the Holy Trinity and the Divinity of Christ. The Catholick Church is of the same Mind still. These Men do make an Overture, and a Declaration of their purpose of joining themselves to the Church, and they do many of 'em put it in Practice. If they are truly reconcil'd to the Catholick Faith, nothing were more desirable: but for that there is need of a better Test, and it is a Question whether the Church ought to receive 'em without better Satisfaction than this *Scheme of Agreement*. They own the *Apostles Creed* indeed, which our Church makes use of in Baptism: but by disowning the *Nicene*, they shew that they do not own the other in the same Sense that the Church does, but repeat the same Words in a very æquivocal Meaning. When we say, *I believe in* Jesus *Christ his only Son*, &c. we do by the Phrase of believing *in* him, mean believing in him as in God properly so called, and so we understand likewise the Form of Baptism in his Name, together with the Father and Holy Spirit. And so did the Ancients: this *Gregory* (35) speaking of the Holy Spirit, and how we are baptiz'd in his Name, *If he be a Creature*, says he, *how do we believe in him? For it is one thing to believe* in *any one, and another to believe something* concerning *him. For the one is peculiar to God: the other common to any thing.* If these Men mean quite another thing in both these, I cannot see how we and they have *One Faith*, or *One Baptism*; nor indeed how we Worship the same God: for the God whom we worship, is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Year after the Apostles 260.

(35) Orat. de Sp. Sancto.

A difference in understanding the Meaning of some Articles of lesser Moment, *viz.* of Christ's Descent into Hell, is not of the same Nature, nor does make an Instance for this purpose. If any Man differ in Opinion from the received Tenets of the Church in smaller Matters; and therefore cannot join in some particular Collect, Office, Prayer, or Clause of a Prayer, wherein something relating to those Tenets is express'd; we grant, what these Men plead, that St. *Paul's* (36) Rule, *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheleß whereto we have attained, let us walk by the same Rule*, &c. teaches that such a Man should continue in Communion, and conform to all that he can, and

(36) Phil. 3. 15, 16.

omit

Year after the Apostles 260.

omit the saying *Amen* to that which he judges a Mistake. Bp. *Stillingfleet* has fully (37) proved this to be the meaning of that place against the Dissenting Ministers, who were not willing that the Separation should sink so. And we can well enough allow of Mr. *le Clerc's* Explication of *Rom.* 14. 1. *Him that is weak in the Faith, receive you without examining his doubtful Opinions;* and that the Church ought to receive such an one. But all this is in differences about such Matters as St. *Paul* there instances in, Meats, Drinks, or other things not of the Foundation. But the Doctrine concerning the Person of *Jesus* Christ, and the Satisfaction for our Sins by him made, is, if any thing be, of the Foundation.

(37) Unreas. of Separ. P. II. §. 19.

I think the Church of *England* has at this time the worst Luck in this respect, that any Church ever had. There are numerous Bodies of her people who hold all the same Faith with her, that do against her Will make Schisms from her Communion on occasion of Differences in Opinion, which are no just Ground for Separation, which Party soever be supposed to be in the right. These she calls and invites to Communion in Prayers, and Sacraments, in which they might join even on supposal that they could not part with their particular Opinions: and they, either out of Peevishness, or else being over perswaded by their Leaders, who find their Account in continuing separate Bodies whereof they may be heads, do refuse to join even in those things wherein they agree in Opinion with us. On the other side, these Men who give but a poor account of their Agreement with us in Fundamentals, declare of their own Accord (whether it be to shelter themselves from Penalties, or not, I know not) that they will however join with us.

The least that can be said, is, that it behoves every Curate, who has good ground to believe concerning any of those that resort to his Communion, that they are Enemies to the Doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour, (and there are up and down more of them than one would think) to take Advice of the Bishop how far such are to be admitted to Communion.

§. 18. I mention'd the Satisfaction of our Saviour for our Sins. It is known how derogatory an Explication the *Socinians* have given of that. They have sometimes so spoke, as if the main or only Design of his Death were to give us a good Example of suffering patiently: fearing that if too much Value were put on his Blood as a sufficient

Ransom

Ransom for the Sins of the World, it must be yielded to be the Blood of one that was God in a proper sense as well as Man. But whereas the New-Testament does almost in every Chapter speak of the Redemption, Propitiation, Sacrifice, Price, Ransom, Purchase, paid or wrought by him, and does lay the stress (38) of our Salvation upon our *Faith in his Blood* as well as in his Doctrine: they do (after having explain'd away as much of this Article as possibly they can) yield that he did satisfie for us a little, or redeem us a little. I have heard one of 'em in company and in a braving way explain it thus; *It is as if a Man ow'd me 1000 l. and not being able to pay, a Friend of his who had some Interest in me, should intercede with me to forgive him the Debt; and to move me the more, should offer to pay Twelve-pence in the Pound for him, and I in condescension to this Friend should accept it for Payment in full.*

Year after the Apostles 260.

(38) Rom. 3. 24, 25.

This is to count (39) *the Blood of the Covenant wherewith we are sanctified* a much more mean and ordinary thing than the Scripture does every where represent it. And that which brought this Passage of a Discourse in company to my Memory, was, the Words which these Men use (40) to shew the Soundness of their Faith in that Matter; *We believe that the Lord Christ by what he did, and what he suffer'd was*, by the gracious Acceptance of God, *a true and perfect Propitiation for Sinners, that repent.* This is what any Catholick, or any *Socinian* either may say, and yet have a very different Faith about this Article.

(39) Heb. 10. 29.

(40) Account of *Firmin's* Religion, p. 19

The other Errors with which they are charg'd, and do not by that *Agreement* revoke, are great; but not to be named the same Day with these.

§. 19. As for the *Assemblies* which they talk of holding *for Divine Worship distinct from the Assemblies of any other Denominations of Christians: but these to be not by way of Schism or Separation from the Church, but only as Fraternities in the Church, who should take a more special Care of that Article* [viz. of the Unity of the Godhead] there would be by God's Grace no need of 'em. The Catholick Church does, and ever did, and ever will hold and publish that Doctrine in the first place and above all others. The *Athanasian* Creed, against which they make their chief Exceptions, declares this in Words as absolute as any they can desire to be devised, that tho' the Father be God, Lord, Almighty, &c. and the Son and Holy Spirit likewise; yet there are not three Gods, Lords, Al-



mighties,

Year after the Apostles 260.

mighties, &c. but one God, one Lord, one Almighty: and would by Parity of Reason have said; so the Father is Spirit, the Son Spirit, and the Holy Ghost Spirit: yet not three Spirits, but one Spirit or Mind.

§. 20. They confess themselves that all Systems, Catechisms, Councils have defined this. But they add, *especially since the* Lateran *Council*, &c. thereby leaving open a Door for that Slander of a (41) Friend of theirs to take place, who goes about to make the World believe that anciently, in the times of the *Nicene* Council, and for some time afterward, the Christians held the Faith of the Trinity so as to make *three Gods* in it.

(41) Mr. *le Clerc*. Supplement to *Hammond*, it. Critical Epistles, &c.

This Slander of an out-landish Author, our *Socinians* do greedily embrace and confidently averr: which has, as to most of the Particulars by which they would prove it, been fully answer'd by (42) Bp. *Stillingfleet*: and I have occasionally, in another place (53) said something to some of the rest on which they insist, and to that open Affront given by the said Slanderer to all the Churches that use the *Nicene* Creed, which he says they must either expunge out of their Confessions and Liturgies, or else renounce the Article of *One God*, pretending that the Faith held forth in that Creed is *Tritheism*. But it comes in my way there by the By only.

(42) Vindication of Trinity CH. 6.

(43) Part II. CH. V. §. 8.

All that I mention it here for, is to shew what an Antipathy this sort of Men have to that Creed, and how they accordingly endeavour to blacken it: which is, as I shew in (44) another place, the most ancient Copy of a Christian Creed that is now extant in the World, and the most universally subscribed to by all Christians, and has been now for so many Ages accounted the only firm Test and Barrier of the Catholick Church against such as deny the Divinity of our Lord Christ: being of Opinion, that we can have no sound Communion with those that renounce it: and that it is a vain and ill advised thing to hope in these late Ages of the Church to pitch or agree on any fitter Symbol or Test of a Catholick Christian. It should be the more unexceptionable with them because it has not the Words, *Trinity*, *Person*, &c. against which their Objections chiefly lie. And yet those of them among us that do put in practice the foresaid Project of communicating with the Church, do, as far as I can understand, generally renounce it, and instead of it they give here a Profession of their Faith, in Words subject to great Ambiguity.

(44) Part II CH. IX. §. 9, 10, 11. &c.

The

Year after the Apostles 260.

The great Bp. *Stillingfleet* (45) having occasion to speak of that Canon (46) of the first Council of *Arles*, wherein they decree, That if any that come over from a sort of *Heresie* there specified, did offer themselves to communicate with the Catholicks, *they should be examin'd by the Priests, whether they had a right Faith of the Trinity*, &c. and if so, they were to be admitted with Imposition of Hands. *But if being examin'd, they do not confess* this Trinity, *then they must be baptized anew.* He asks this Question, *What Trinity do they mean? of meer Names or Cyphers, or of one God and two Creatures joined in the same form of Words, as our Unitarians understand it?*

214.

(45) Vindic. of Trinity c. 9.

(46) Can. 8.

150.

And to the same purpose St. *Cyprian* arguing that such as had received Baptism from some Hereticks that had monstrous Opinions about the Deity, ought not to be admitted to Communion without a new Baptism, says thus, (47) *If by that Baptism of theirs the Man have obtained Remission of Sins, then is he sanctified and become* a Temple of God. *Now I ask of what God? If they say, of God the Creator, that could not be, since he did not believe in him. If of Christ; one that* denys Christ to be God *cannot be a Temple of him. If of the holy Spirit; whereas* these three are one, *how can the Holy Spirit be pleas'd with him who is against either the Father or the Son?*

(47) Ep. 73 ad Jubianum.

We may by the By take Notice, that it appears by this and by another plainer (48) place of St. *Cyprian*, that that Text (49) of St. *John*, *These three are one*, either was read then (which was long before the time of *Arius*) with the same Context that it is now, or at least was understood in the same Sence.

(48) lib. de Unitate ecclesiæ.

(49) 1 John 5. 7.

If these ancient Christians would not admit such Men, tho' recanting their Opinions, without a new Baptism, I mean, if they had been baptized into any other Faith than the true Faith of the Trinity; much less would they have entertain'd Communion with them holding still their Opinions.

It is St. *Gregory*'s mentioning in this *Oration of Baptism* a thing that is so applyable to the case of the Church at present, that has drawn me so far from my subject.

Year after the Apostles 260.

# CHAP. XII.

## *Quotations out of St.* Basil.

§. 1. ST. *Basil* also has an Oration or Sermon to the Catechumens or new converted Christians, to perswade 'em to Baptism without such Delays as many used: but it has not any Express mention of the case of Infants as to Baptism: yet it has some things that are cited *pro* and *contra* to that purpose. It may not be amiss to give a short Abstract of it, reciting, as I did in the other, the original Words of such places only as do by some consequence relate to this Question.

### *Oratio Exhortatoria ad Baptismum.*

He begins with observing that *Solomon* mentioning a time for every thing, says, *there is a time to be born, and a time to die*, placing the Birth first: but that he being to speak of the spiritual Birth, must speak of our spiritual Death first. Which having done, and shewn the lost Condition we are in by Nature, and that Baptism is the Recovery from it, he proceeds.

§. 2 Καιρὸς μὲν ἐν ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπιτήδειος· ἴδιος ὕπνου, καὶ ἴδιος γρηγορήσεως, ἴδιος πολέμου καὶ ἴδιος εἰρήνης. Καιρὸς δὲ βαπτίσματος ἅπας ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος. *There is therefore a several Season proper for several things; a time peculiar for Sleep, and one peculiar for Watching; a time for War, and a time for Peace. But any time of ones Life is proper for Baptism.* And afterward, *Be it Day or Night, be it but an Hour or a Minute, yet the most proper time is* Easter: *for that is the Solemnity of the Resurrection; and Baptism is to us a ground of our Resurrection.*

§. 3. Then having insisted on the Advantage of *Christ's* Baptism above that of St. *John's*, and how all are invited to it: he addresses thus to 'em; Ὀκνεῖς καὶ βραδύνεις καὶ διαμέλλεις; οὐκ νυπίε τὸν λόγον κατηχήθης ἔπω συνέθη τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; πάντοτε μανθάνων οὐδέπω ἦλθες πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν; πειρασὴς διὰ βίου, κατάσκοπος μισχεῖ γήρως; πότε γενήσῃ χριστιανός; πότε γνωρίσωμέν σε οἱ ἡμέτεροι, &c. *Do you demur and loyter and put it off? When you have been from a Child catechiz'd in the Word, Are you not yet acquainted with the Truth? Having been always*

*ways learning it, Are you not yet come to the Knowledge of it? A Seeker all your Life long: A Considerer till you are old: When will you be made a Christian? When shall we see you become one of us? Last Year you were for staying till this Year: and now you have a Mind to stay till next. Take heed that by promising your self a longer Life, you do not quite miss of your Hope. You don't know what Change to morrow may bring*, &c.

Year after the Apostles 260.

§. 4. When I first copied out this Passage to put it into this Collection, I thought it to be the strongest Evidence against the general Practice of Infant-Baptism in those times of any that is to be found in all Antiquity (tho' it has not, I think, been taken notice of by any of the Antipædobaptists) for it plainly supposes that a considerable part of St. *Basil's* Auditory at this time were such as had been *from their Childhood* instructed in the Christian Religion (and consequently in all Probability born of Christian Parents) and yet not baptiz'd.

But I have since, in searching after other Passages, had occasion more than enough to observe, that there were in these times abundance of People that were well-Willers to Christianity, half Christians, who yet put off their absolute owning of it, or being baptiz'd into it for a great many Years. These Men had, during that their unsettled Mind, several Children: and they could not with any Face or Conscience desire of the Church Baptism for these their Infant-Children, unless they would first find in their Hearts to accept it for themselves. And so these Children came to be taught the Doctrine of Christianity, and yet not baptiz'd into it, because their Parents, tho' liking of that Religion, yet were not at present fully resolved themselves. But this is no Proof that any Christians, after they were once baptized themselves, did ever suffer their Infant-Children to go without Baptism.

This place it self is a plain Proof that there were a great many such Men as I have mention'd: for several of the Men to whom St. *Basil* is here preaching, and whom he blames for putting off Baptism so long, must be thought to have Children; which Children must be in the case that I speak of. So that this place affords an Answer to the Objection drawn from it self, or from any other that speaks of Children instructed in Religion and yet not baptized.

Year after the Apostles 260.

§. 5. He goes on with his Sermon, and shews the Advantages of this Profession to which he invites 'em, and the Lightness of the Yoke which he advises 'em to put on. And proceeds to speak of the Necessity of Baptism in these Words; Ὁ Ἰουδαῖος τῷ περιτομῷ ἐκ ὑπερβίβασιν διὰ τὴν ἀπειλὴν, ὅτι πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἥτις ἡ περιτμηθήσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τῶν λαῶν αὐτῆς. σὺ δὲ τὴν ἀχειροποίητον, περιτομὴν ἀναβαλῇ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τελειουμένην, αὐτῷ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀκούσας, Ἀμὴν, Ἀμὴν, &c. *A Jew does not delay Circumcision because of the threatning that* every Soul that is not circumcised the eighth Day shall be cut off from his People: *And dost thou put off* the Circumcision made without Hands in the putting off the Flesh, *which is performed in Baptism, when thou hearest our Lord himself say*, verily, I say unto you, except one be born of Water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of God? *If* Israel *had not passed thro' the Sea, they had not got rid of* Pharaoh: *and unless thou pass thro' the Water, thou wilt not be delivered from the cruel Tyranny of the Devil*, &c.

*If your Sins are many; be not frighted because of their Number: where Sin has abounded, there Grace will much more abound, if you will receive it. If they are small and not very heinous, why are you afraid of the time to come, since you have order'd your past Life well, even when you were not furnish'd with the Christian Law?*

§. 6. *Look upon your Soul to be plac'd in a Balance: the Angels draw you one way, the Devils the other: To which will you incline? Which shall overcome, carnal Pleasure or Holiness of Life?*

*Don't you remember how in* Egypt *the Destroyer passed over the Houses that were marked, when in those that were not so he slew the first born?*

*If a Physician could undertake by any Art to make you young again when you are old, you would earnestly long for that Day in which your florid Youth should be restored: and yet now when 'tis told you that your Soul, defil'd with all manner of Sin may be renewed and born again by Baptism, you slight so great a Benefit.*

*Are you young? guard your Youth with the Bridle of Baptism. Is the Flower of your Age past? don't endanger the Loss of your* Viaticum: *don't miss of your Preservative: don't think of your* eleventh Hour *as if it were your first.*

*I know your reason, tho' you think to conceal it.* 'Stay a little longer, *say you*, I will make use of the Flower of my

'my Age in Pleasure, &c. and then when I have enough 'of that, I'll give it over and be baptiz'd. *Think you that God does not see your Purpose, or that he will give his Grace to so wicked a Heart?* ——— *If you leave off your Sins for Old-Age, Thanks to your Inability. We regard those that are sober by Choice not by Necessity.*

Year after the Apostles 260.

*Who has given you a Lease of your Life?* &c. *Don't you see Children often snatch'd from the Breast, and others die in the Flower of their Age?* &c.

*Do you stay for Baptism till some Fever force you to it, when you will neither be able to speak the holy Words, nor perhaps to hear 'em, the Disease being got into your Head?*

*The Devil cry's*, give me to Day, and give the Morrow to God. *But God says*, To Day if you will hear my Voice. *The Devil gives us Hope of to Morrow, but when to Morrow is come, as a fraudulent Divider, he again asks that Day for himself, and yields the next to Morrow to God.*

*The Sanctification of Baptism you commend in Words, but in your Deeds you follow the things that your self condemn. Take heed you don't repent of this purpose when it is too late, and will do you no good. Learn Wisdom by the Example of the foolish Virgins*, &c.

*Do not you, Brother, in like manner put off from Year to Year, from Month to Month, from Day to Day, till a Day seize you that you are not aware of, and the Opportunity of Well-doing fail you together with your Life*, &c.

*Then you'll lament at your very Soul, but no body will pity you: you'll utter dreadful Moans, but they will be taken for a* delirium. *Who will give you Baptism at such a time?* &c. *and perhaps it will be Night, and no Body present to help you or baptize you.*

*But you say*, God will then hear me. *Yes, because you hear him now.* He will grant me some longer time. *Good Reason, because you make so good use of what he does grant you. Wretch, don't deceive your self: let no body seduce you with vain Words, sudden Destruction will come upon you, and ruine like a Storm*, &c. *The dreadful Angel will fetch away your Soul*, &c.

*What Thoughts will you have then?* 'Fool that I was! 'Why did not I put off this heavy load of Sin then when 'I might easily? that I did not wash off these foul 'Stains? &c. Oh woful Purpose of mine! for the short 'Pleasure of Sin to suffer eternal Torments. I might 'now have been one of those that shine in Glory. Oh 'just Judgment of God! I was called and would not 'hear, &c.

Year after the Apostles 260.

*These and such like Complaints you will make then, if you depart hence before you be baptized*, &c.

All the rest is such like pathetical Exhortation to break off Sin, and enter without Delay into the Christian Covenant: and were very proper to be us'd to those who now a days put off Repentance to a Death-Bed.

(1) lib. 1us & 2us de baptismo.

§. 7. St. *Basil* has also two other (1) Pieces about Baptism, written at the Desire of some that put Questions to him, some concerning Baptism, and some on other Subjects (being probably Persons that were preparing themselves to be baptiz'd.) But all the Discourse is (as the Occasion was) of what is proper for Adult Persons to know and consider, when they come to be baptiz'd: and has nothing that peculiarly concerns Infants.

He puts these Persons in mind ὅτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, *that they must be first instructed, and then admitted to Baptism.* (These Words taken by themselves, some cite as making against Infant-Baptism) that they must resolve to forsake, not some Sins, but all. He shews 'em the difference of three sorts of Baptism, *viz.* that of *Moses*, that of *John*, and that of *Christ*: The Baptism of *Moses* made a difference of Sins; for all Sins were not forgiven by it. It requir'd Sacrifices to be joined with it. It stood strictly on outward Cleansing. It enjoin'd an unclean Person to continue separate for some time: depended upon Days and Hours, *&c.* The Baptism of *John* had none of these Inconveniencies: yet he shews how that also is far surpassed by that of Christ.

§. 8. Coming to a more particular Explication of our Saviour's Words, *John* 3. 3, 5. of being *born again*, he says, *I take that word* [ἄνωθεν again] *to signifie the rectifying of our former birth, which was in the filth of sin: as* Job *says*; no Person is clean from Sin, tho' his Life be but of one Day; [so they read that (2) text of *Job*] *and as* David *laments and says*, I was conceived in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother bring me forth.

(2) Job. 14. 4.

§. 9. There is a Passage in a Sermon of St. *Basil*'s (that which he preach'd on a *Fast-day*, that was kept for the great *Famine and Drought*) of which I have not Skill enough to judge whether it be a Proof of Infants Baptism then used or not. The Judgment of it depends on one's knowing particularly to what part of the publick Divine Service and Prayers People were wont to be admited before they were Baptiz'd; and to what not: for St. *Basil* speaks here

here of little Boys and young Children joining in the Prayers. I know that some have written accurately the History of the Catechumens, and in what parts of the Liturgy they did partake. But the Passage being short, I can sooner set it down at adventure (that so they that are skill'd in that matter may judge whether it be to purpose or not) than I can at present have recourse to those Writings. Year after the Apostles 260.

'Tis this. He is telling 'em that their Continuance in their Sins hindred their Prayers from being heard. But besides, says he, *What sort of Prayer is it that we make? The grown Men, all but a few, follow their Trades,* &c. *a very few are left to join with me in the Prayers; and those lazy and yawning, and staring about,* &c. οἱ δὲ παῖδες οἱ συμμετεχόμενοι ἤδη, οἱ τὰς δέλτους ἐν τοῖς διδασκαλείοις ἀπαθέντες, καὶ συμβοῶντες ἡμῖν ὡς ἄνεσιν μᾶλλον καὶ τέρψιν τὸ πρᾶγμα μετέρχονται, &c. ἀνάιδεσι δὲ καὶ ἄμεμπτα βρέφη πρὸς τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν ἐπείγεται καὶ ἀθροίζεται, εἰς τὴν ἀθυμίαν τῶν λυπουμένων, εἰς τὸ συνάθροισμα προσεύξασθαι γνῶσιν ἢ δύναμιν ἔχοντα· σὺ μοὶ πάρελθε εἰς μέσον, &c. *And these little Boys that have left their Books at School, and do make the Responses together* [or, Sing together] *with us, do it as a piece of Pleasure, and the work of a Play-day,* &c. *And the Infants that have no Sense, nor any Guilt, they also are brought thick and in Crowds to the Publick Confession, who neither understand the occasion of the Grief, nor are capable of praying accordingly. Come your selves to the Office, you that have the load of Sins upon you. 'Tis you that ought to prostrate your selves, to mourn and weep,* &c. ἴδοι δὲ παρεῖναι κἀκεῖνο, μετὰ σοῦ πάντως, ἐ μόνον. *They* [*the Infants*] *ought to be present indeed, but to come along with you, and not alone by themselves.*

If the Catechumens did not use to be admitted before their Baptism to those parts of the Office, that consisted in Psalmody and making the Responses; then it is a sign that these little Boys had been Baptized. But if they did, it is only my Labour lost in reciting it here. P. S. I am since certified by a very Learned Man, that these Children must have been Baptized.

§. 10. But a more material Evidence than any that can be found in St. *Basil*'s Writings, is taken from his Practice: Of which there is an Authentical Record given by *Theodoret* and other Historians that lived but a little after St. *Basil*, in reference to the Baptizing of a Child of *Valens* the Emperor. This Emperor being an *Arian*, and having been prevailed on by the *Arians* to take an (3) Oath that he would always maintain that Faith, and persecute the contrary, *viz.* that of the Catholicks, did accord- 320. (3) Theodor. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 12.

Year after the Apostles 260.

accordingly; and raised great Persecution against all the Catholick Bishops in his Dominion, and particularly against St. *Basil*, who was Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*. But having great Afflictions in his Family at the same time, which looked like Judgments; and among the rest, his only Child sick and at the point of Death; he was wrought on partly by the Guilt of his Conscience, and partly by his Wife's entreaty, to abate of the rigour which he was then using against St. *Basil*, who was by all lookt on as a Pious and Good Man. And he also sent for him to come and pray for his Child. *And then* (as (4) *Theodoret* proceeds to relate the matter) ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος καταλαβὼν τὰ βασίλεια, καὶ τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως υἱὸν παρ' αὐτὸν ὄντα τῶν τελευτῶν διεσάμενος, πρὸς τὸν ζῶντα τοῦτον ὑποστρέφειν ὑπέχετο, εἰ τοῦ παντοίου βαπτίσματος διὰ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἀξιωθείη, καὶ τάδε τοιαῦτα εἰπὼν ἐξελήλυθει. Ὁ δὲ τὸν ὅρκον κατὰ τὸν ἀνόητον μεμνημένος Ἡρώδην, τοῖς συμπαροῦσιν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς συμμορείας Ἀρείου βαπτίσαι τὸ παιδίον προσέταξεν. *The great* Basil *coming into the Palace, and seeing the Emperor's Son at the point of Death, undertook that he would recover if he had Baptism given him by the hands of the Godly* [meaning the Catholicks;] *and having said this he went away. But he* [the Emperor] *remembring, like foolish* Herod, *his Oath, gave order to some that were present of the Faction of* Arius *to Baptize the Child*, &c.

(4) Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 17.

The issue was; the Child died, and *Valens* for the present Repented both of his Oath and Cruelty, and went to St. *Basil*'s Church, and made his Oblations: But afterward he Revolted to his former Temper.

All that is doubtful in this Passage, is, whether this Child were so young as that his Baptism deserve to be called Infant Baptism, or whether he were of such Age as to be capable to be Baptiz'd on his own Profession. *Theodoret*, we see, calls him παιδίον, which properly signifies *a little Child* or *Infant*: And is the same Word that is used; *Mark* 10. 13. προσέφερον παιδία, *They brought young Children*, and *Matt.* 2. 11. εὗρον τὸ παιδίον *They found the young Child wrapped in swaddling cloaths*. *Gregory Nazianzen* (5) says that he was there present with St. *Basil* at that time: And he compares the Emperor's Afflicting himself for his Child to *David's*, for his in the like Case, but mentions not the Age. *Socrates* (6) calls him παῖδιον υἱὸν τοῦ Οὐάλεντος, *the Infant Son of* Valens.

(5) Orat. in Basilium.

(6) Hist. lib. 4. c. 26.

But

But there is among the Works of *Ephræm Syrus* published in *Latin*, a Sermon on St. *Basil*, in which he mentions this Story; but speaks so of the Child, as if he had some understanding of Religion: For he makes *Basil* Covenant with *Valens*; *If you will so deliver him to me, that I may bring him to the true Faith, and free him from the impiety of the* Arian *Doctrine*, &c. And again, *They* [the *Arians*] *Baptized him with Water, but not with the Spirit, for they taught him to reject the Son of God*, &c. But the Works of this Father which we have, are of such doubtful Credit (they must first have been Translated out of *Syriac*: For he understood no other Language, and they abound with very frivolous Stories) that a Quotation out of 'em cannot come in Competition with the received Historians. Year after the Apostles 260.

§. 11. *Valesius* (7) has gone about to find out by Chronological Characters the Age of this Child when he died: Not in any enquiry about Infant Baptism, but to set some Passages right in Chronology. He makes him to be six years old. The Proofs of it are something forc'd, and are too nice and far from our purpose to be repeated here. He judges that it was he that was Consul *Anno Dom.* 369. with *Victor*, (tho' the name there be *Valentinian*, and the Historians call this Child's name *Galates*) and that *Socrates* mistook *Valentinian* the younger for this Child: And that it was on him that *Themistius* made that *Consular Oration* (for the flattery of that time was to make Emperor's Infant Children, *Consuls*, and speak Orations to 'em) where he says, *Even while you are carried in Peoples Arms, you make War together with your Father.*

(7) Annot. in Socrat. l. 4. c. 10. it. 26.

But suppose it were so; he must yet be Baptiz'd with the form of Infant Baptism: For a Child of six years old is capable of no other. And if he were so old as six years, he must be born before his Father was Baptized into the Christian Religion himself. For by this account this Child was born to *Valens* before the Victory over *Procopius* the Usurper, and so *Valesius* owns. Now that Victory was before the beginning of *Valens* his War against the *Goths*: And it was in that War that he being minded to go to Battle in Person, (8) *thought not fit to go unprovided of the Divine Grace, but to guard himself with the Armour of Baptism.* And if the Child were Born before his Father was Baptized, that might be the reason that he was not Baptiz'd quickly after his Birth.

(8) Theodoret H. E. l. 4. c. 11, 12.

CHAP

# CHAP. XIII.

## Quotations out of St. *Ambrose.*

### *Ambrosius Comment. l. 1. in St. Lucæ c. 1.*

Year after the Apostles 274.

§. 1. HE is there Commenting on those Words, *Luke* 1. 17. where the Angel Prophecies of *John* the Baptist, *He shall go before him in the Spirit and Power of* Elias. And after having shewn in several particulars how *John* in his Office did resemble *Elias*, and having mentioned that Miracle of *Elias* of dividing the River *Jordan*, he adds these Words,

*Sed fortasse hoc supra nos & supra Apostolos videatur expletum. Nam ille sub Eliâ diviso amne fluvialium recursus undarum in originem fluminis (sicut dicit scriptura; Jordanes conversus est retrorsum) significavit salutaris lavacri futura mysteria; per quæ in primordia naturæ suæ qui baptizati fuerint parvuli à Malitiâ reformantur.*

'But perhaps this may seem to be fulfilled in our time 'and in the Apostle's time. For that returning of the 'River Waters backward toward the Spring head, which 'was caused by *Elias* when the River was divided (as 'the Scripture says, Jordan *was driven back*) signified the 'Sacrament of the laver of Salvation, which was after-'ward to be Instituted; by which those *Infants* that are 'Baptized, are reformed back again from Wickedness '[or, a wicked State] to the Primitive State of their 'Nature.

He means, they are freed from the guilt of original Sin, and in some sense reduced back to the Primitive State, in which Man was before that happened. He plainly speaks here of Infants as Baptized *in the Apostle's time*, as well as in his own.

Appendix

This Passage of St. *Ambrose* is Quoted by St. *Austin*, *lib. 1. contra Julian. c. 2.*

### *Ambrosius l. 2. de Abraham. patriarchâ, c. 11.*

§. 2. He is here speaking of that part of the History of *Abraham*,

*braham*, where he is commanded to be Circumcised, and to Circumcise his Infants, and of the severity of the Penalty on an Infant that is not Circumcised: And has these Words in Relation to Circumcision, *For a very good reason does the Law command the Males to be Circumcised in the beginning of Infancy, even the Bondslave born in the House: Because as Circumcision is from Infancy, so is the Disease. No time ought to be void of the Remedy, because none is void of Guilt*, &c. And a little after, *Neither a Proselyte that is old, nor an Infant born in the House is excepted; because every Age is obnoxious to Sin, and therefore every Age is proper for the Sacrament.* He also applies this to spiritual Circumcision and Baptisin; and says, *The meaning of the mystery is plain. Those born in the House are the Jews, those bought with Money are the Gentiles that believed: For the Church is bought with the price of Christ's Blood. Therefore both Jew and Gentile and all that believe must learn to Circumcise themselves from Sin, that they may be saved. Both the Heme born and the Foreigner, the Just and the Sinful, must be Circumcised by the Forgiveness of Sins, so as not to practise Sin any more: For no Person comes to the Kingdom of Heaven but by the Sacrament of Baptism*: And at the end of that Paragraph cites these Words of our Saviour, giving his Note on 'em.

Year after the Apostles 274.

*Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ & spiritu sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei. Utique nullum excipit: Non infantem, non aliquâ præventum necessitate. Habeant tamen illam opertam pœnarum immunitatem, nescio an habeant regni honorem.*

'For unless any Person be born again of Water, and 'of the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom 'of God. *You see he excepts no Person, not an Infant, not one that is hindred by any unavoidable Accident.*

*But suppose that such have that freedom from Punishment which is not clear, yet I Question whether they shall have the honour of the Kingdom.*

This as to the need of Baptizing Infants is plain: But I know not what to make of the Word [*opertam*] in this Sentence, unless it be to be render'd as I have render'd it [*which is not clear*: or, *of which we have no certain knowledge.*]

Many Writers of the *Greek* Church do speak of a certain middle state in the life to come, in which Infants that die unbaptized, and also other Persons that miss of Baptism, not by their own fault, but by some accidental

Year after the Apostles 274.

tal hindrance, shall be placed; which place or state, shall not, as they think, partake, or not much partake either of Happiness or Torment. *Gregory Nazianzen's* Words to that purpose are in the (1) Passages I cited of his, and I shall have occasion hereafter (2) to mention more. But this Opinion of a middle State seems not to have taken any footing in the *Latin* Church at this time; tho' it be since embraced by the Papists, under the name of *limbus puerorum.*

(1) CH. XI. §. 6.
(2) Part 2. CH. VI. §. 4.

St. *Ambrose*, who was Conversant in the *Greek* Writers, and, as St. *Hierom* (3) observes, borrow'd much out of their Works, had met with it there; and here mentions it, but calls it *opertam*, a thing not certainly revealed or known, but *hidden* and uncertain. His meaning is, that since our Saviour's Sentence of the necessity of Baptism for entring the Kingdom of God, is general, and does not except Infants. It is very Questionable, whether an Infant unbaptized can have the said Kingdom? And as for the middle State between Heaven and Hell, which some do suppose, it is to us a thing hidden or unknown whether there be any such State.

(3) Præfat. in lib. Didymi.

St. *Austin*, a little after these times, does earnestly labour to shew that there is no such State, tho' he had once so spoken as if he thought there might. I shall have occasion to produce his Sayings on (4) one side and the (5) other. He is the more earnest at this latter place against the middle State, because *Pelagius* had serv'd himself of this Notion to evade the Argument which is taken from the need that Infants have of Baptism, to prove that they have original Sin. For *Pelagius* said, they have no Sin; and if they dye unbaptiz'd, they will not be punish'd, but be in that middle State.

(4) CH. XV. Sect. 3. §. 1, 2.
(5) CH. XIX. §. 10.

The Quotations out of the Book *de Vocatione Gentium*, and *Epist. ad Demetriadem*, I have not, as many do, set down to St. *Ambrose*, because they are not his, but *Prosper's*, or Pope *Leo's*; who yet lived both of them but a little after our Period. Every body has read how largely *Prosper* there Disputes against those that would maintain, that all the Grace of God depends upon our use of Free-will, shewing that they that use that Method of explaining the Events that happen, can never solve that Difficulty, *How it comes to pass that so great a multitude of Infants dying unbaptized* [or, as he stiles it, unregenerated] *do perish.* On which Argument he has a whole Chapter, pretending

340.
344.

tending to ſhew that all muſt be attributed to God's free giving or refuſing his Grace.

---

## CHAP. XIV.

## Quotations out of St. *John Chryſoſtom.*

§. 1. ST. *Chryſoſtom* has had more of his Works publiſhed than any of the foregoing, becauſe every thing that he Preach'd or Dictated was thought fit to be publiſh'd; not that he had any greater skill in Divinity than ordinary, but becauſe of his Golden Tongue, from which he had this name, and which made the People that us'd to hear him ſay, *They had rather the Sun ſhould not ſhine, than that* John *ſhould not Preach.* But of the multitude that were publiſh'd a great many are loſt; and, to make up the defect, a great many ſpurious ones have been ſet out under his name. The Induſtry and Skill of the latter Ages, and particularly of Sir *Henry Savile*, has in a good degree fann'd and diſtinguiſh'd the one from the other.

Year after the Apoſtles 280.

Therefore I ſhall omit the Quotations about this ſubject, that are found in thoſe Books that are either plainly ſpurious, or ſuſpected; tho' they are probably very Ancient, and of Men that lived at, or about the ſame time. Of the firſt ſort is the *Homily* concerning *Adam* and *Eve*, in which is a Paſſage mentioning Infant Baptiſm; but it is plainly the Work of ſome later Author. Of the ſecond is the *Homily* on *Pſal.* 14. in which is a paſſage of the ſame Subject, which is Quoted in this Controverſie, by many Learned Men, *Caſſander, &c.* and even by Bp. (1) *Stillingfleet.*

(1) Unreaſonableneſs of Sep. Part 3. ch. 36.

As for the paſſages in his genuine Works, he has not many on this Subject, for Orators love only ſuch Subjects as may be adorn'd with flowers of Rhetoric, of which ſo plain a thing as the Baptizing of Infants is not ſo capable; and for thoſe which he has, I am not very Confident that I have all that are in ſo many Voluminous Books: But thoſe which I ſhall produce do plainly ſhew his Senſe, and the Practice of the Churches where he liv'd, which were *Antioch* and *Conſtantinople.*

*Hom.*

Year after the Apoſtles 280. for the Words are the ſame which I recited of St. *Baſil's.* St. *Auſtin* is there proving that *Chryſoſtom*, as well as the other Catholick Doctors, owned original Sin, which *Julian* denied, tho' he owned Infant Baptiſm.

*The ſame, Holy* John, *even he as well as the Martyr* Cyprian, *teaches that the Circumciſion of the Fleſh was commanded in way of a Type of Baptiſm.* Then he recites theſe Words, as from *Chryſoſtom, A Jew does not delay Circumciſion becauſe of the threatning*, &c. *and doſt thou delay the Circumciſion made without hands*, &c. as they ſtand recited (8) above. Then St. *Auſtin* adds, *You ſee how this Man eſtabliſh'd in the Eccleſiaſtical Doctrine compares Circumciſion to Circumciſion, and Threat to Threat: That which it is* not to be Circumciſed on the 8th day; *that it is* not to be Baptized in Chriſt; *and what it is* to be cut off ſtom his People; *that it is* not to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. *And yet you* [Pelagians] *ſay that in the Baptiſm of Infants there is no putting off the Fleſh*, i. e. *No Circumciſion made without hands, when you affirm that they have nothing which needs to be put off: For you do not confeſs them to be* dead in the (9) uncircumciſion of the Fleſh, *by which is meant* Sin, *eſpecially that Sin which is deriv'd originally: for by reaſon of this, our Body is the* Body (10) of Sin, *which the Apoſtle ſays* is deſtroyed by the Croſs of Chriſt.

(8) CH. XII. §. 5.

(9) Col. 2. 13.

(10) Rom. 6. 6.

§. 3. There is another paſſage in a Homily of St. *Chryſoſtom ad Baptizatos*, which is not now extant in *Greek*, but is cited by *Julian* in *Latin*, and by St. *Auſtin* in *Greek*, which is full to this purpoſe of Infant Baptiſm. The Citations are in St. *Auſtin's l.* 1. *contra Julianum*; where *Julian* ſays thus,

*Holy* John, *Biſhop of* Conſtantinople, *denies that there is any original Sin in Infants; for in that* Homily *which he preacht concerning* Baptized Perſons, *he ſays,*

'Bleſſed be God, who only does Wonders, who has 'Created and Order'd all things: Loe! they do en- 'joy the ſerenity of Freedom, who but even now were 'held in Captivity: They are become Citizens of the 'Church, who were in the Vagabond ſtate of Aliens; 'and they are enter'd into the Lot of the Righteous, who 'were under the Confuſion of Sin. For they are not 'only Free, but Holy; nor Holy only, but Juſtified; 'and not only Juſtified, but Sons; and not only Sons, 'but Heirs; not Heirs only, but Brothers of Chriſt; 'not only his Brethren, but Coheirs; not Coheirs only,

'but

'but Members of him; not Members only, but his 'Temple; and not his Temple only, but Organs of his 'Spirit. You ſee how many are the Benefits of Bap- 'tiſm. And yet ſome think that the Heavenly Grace 'conſiſts only in forgiveneſs of Sins; but I have rec- 'kon'd up ten Advantages of it. *For this cauſe we Bap- 'tize Infants alſo, tho' they are not defiled with Sin*; that 'there may be ſuperadded to them Holineſs, Righteouſ- 'neſs, Adoption, Inheritance, a Brotherhood with Chriſt, 'and to be made Members of him.

Year after the Apoſtles 280.

§. 4. This Sentence *Julian* brought to ſhew that *Chryſoſtom*'s Senſe was, that Infants are Baptiz'd, not for forgiveneſs of Sins, from which they are free, but only that they might have a right to Chriſt's Kingdom: Which was exactly what *Julian* and his party, who denied original Sin, would have.

And indeed it was a ſhrewd place; and St. *Auſtin* has much ado to bring off this Rhetorical Harangue clear from Hereſie; he uſes three ways to do it.

1. He ſhews how improbable it was that *John*, living in the Catholick Church, and being a renowned Biſhop in it, ſhould really hold a Doctrine ſo contrary to that which he had ſhewn by Inſtances to be the general Senſe of all Catholick Doctors.

2. He produces other paſſages out of his Writings, which do plainly own the Orthodox Doctrine of the Guilt of original Sin, however incongruouſly he may ſeem to ſpeak in this place.

3. As to the place it ſelf, he ſhews that *Julian* had not Tranſlated the Words exactly true, but had given the Expreſſion a turn to his own Advantage; for whereas the Words are in the Greek, *tho' they have not any Sins*; *Julian* had made uſe of a faulty *Latin* Tranſlation, in which ſome Copies read, *not defiled with Sins*, others, *with Sin*, in the ſingular Number. Of which laſt Copy St. *Auſtin* ſays, *I doubt ſome of your Party have choſen to expreſs it in the ſingular Number, that it might be taken for that* one Sin, *of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks:* (11) Judgment came by one [Sin] to Condemnation; but the free gift is of many Offences unto Juſtification.—— *You choose to word it*; not defiled with Sin, *that that* one Sin *of the firſt Man might come into the Reader's Mind.*

(11) Rom. 5. 16.

Year after the Apostles 280.

*But not to go by suspicions; and supposing this to be the mistake of the Scribe, or the variety of the Interpreter: I will set down the* Greek *Words themselves which* John *spoke,* Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ παιδία βαπτίζομεν καίτοι ἁμαρτήματα μὴ ἔχοντα. *Which is,* For this reason we Baptize Infants also, tho' they have not any Sins. *You see, he did not say that Infants are not defiled with Sin, or Sins; but that they have not any Sins: Understand it,* of their own, *and there is no dispute. But you will say, Why did he not say,* of their own? *Why do you think, but for this reason, because he, Discoursing in the Catholick Church, suppos'd that he could be understood in no other Sence? No Body was puzzled about that Matter. You* [Pelagians] *not having then rais'd any Controversie, he spoke with less Caution.*

Perhaps there might have been added to St. *Austin*'s Answer this, that the *Greek* Writers, tho' they own this natural Corruption, yet do not generally by the Property of their Language call it by the name of *Sin*; but they express by the name of *natural Defilement, Pollution, Disease* and the like, that which the *Latins* call *original Sin.* The word ἁμαρτία, and especially ἁμάρτημα do properly with them signifie an *Actual* Sin or Transgression. So *Theodoret* who liv'd a little after these times, and consequently ought to speak with more Caution, and was no favourer of *Pelagianism* (for that was a time when *Pelagius* and his Opinions having been lately Condemned by Canons and Edicts in all parts of the World, it was no time for a Bishop of the Catholick Church to own them) yet speaks thus; (12) *Baptism is not (as the silly* Messalians *say) a razor only to cut off Sins that are past, which it does over and above. For if it had no other effect but that what need we baptize Infants, that have not tasted of* Sin? *The Sacrament promises not this only, but greater and higher things; for it is a Pledge of future Blessings, a Type of the Resurrection, a Communication of Christ's Passion,* &c.

320.

(12) Hæretic. Fabular. l. 5. c. de Baptismo.

312.

And this is made more plain by the Phrase used by *Isidorus Pelusiota* (who as well as *Theodoret* was a Disciple of St. *Chrysostom,* and both of 'em followers of his Doctrine, and Imitators, as far as they could, of his Expression.) For he, at the same place, speaks of Infants as not having any *Sin,* and yet being defiled with the Corruption caused by *Adam*'s Transgression. His Words are, (13)

(13) Lib. 3. Epist. 195. ad Herminum Comitem.

*Whereas*

*Whereas your Excellency wrote to me, desiring to know for what reason* βρέφη ἀναμάρτητα ὄντα βαπτίζεται, *Infants that have no Sin are Baptized. I have thought it needful to give you my Answer. Some that speak below the dignity of the Subject, say it is, that they may wash off that Pollution,* ῥύπον, *which is transmitted on humane Nature by the Transgression of* Adam. *I also do believe that that is done, but not that only (for that were not so great a Matter) but that a great many other Graces far transcending our Nature, are thereby given:* And so he goes on to reckon up Redemption, Regeneration, Adoption, *&c.* much to the same purpose as St. *Chrysostom* does. Year after the Apostles 280.

This shews that in their way of speaking, Infants (tho' acknowledged to have a Pollution of Nature from *Adam* which needed washing off) yet were said not to have ἁμαρτίας or ἁμαρτήματα, Sins. And even those Commendations of Baptism, and the effects of it in Infants, that it is Redemption, Regeneration, *&c.* do suppose an evil State from which they are Redeemed, Regenerated, *&c.* which state is the same that the *Latins* call original Sin.

But be that how it will; St. *Chrysostom* speaks plainly of the *practice* of Infant Baptism. And our present inquiry is to know the practice of the Churches, and not whether he had a right apprehension of all the grounds of it. If any in these times used it, and did not well appehend the grounds of it; it is the greater sign that they were satisfied that it had ever been done.

§. 5. Another passage of St. *Chrysostom* does not mention Baptism by name; but yet it plainly refers to the Custom of making on the Infants Forehead the sign of the Cross at his Baptism. It is this,

*Hom.* 12. *in* 1. *Epist. ad Corinthios.* (14) (14) Prope finem.

He is there blaming the Women for several superstitious and heathenish Rites, which they practis'd upon their new-born Infants; one was, a Custom that they had of rubbing the Forehead of the Child with a sort of Dirt, prepared with some Magical Tricks, which was to preserve it from being bewitch'd. He tells 'em that such a practice, instead of guarding and purifying the Infant makes it abominable: The Words are,

Year after the Apostles, 280.

Ὁ βορβόρῳ χείων πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ βδελυκτὸν ποιεῖ τὸ παιδίον; πῶς γὰρ ἀπὶ προσάγει ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ ἱερέως; εἰπέ μοι, πῶς ἀξιοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ μετώπου σφραγίδα ἐπιτεθῆναι παρὰ τὴν τοῦ προεσβυτέρου χεῖρα, ἔνθα τὸν βόρβορον ἐπέχεισας.

*He that anoints an Infant so with that Dirt, how can he think but that he makes it abominable? How can he bring it to the hands of the Priest? Tell me, how can you think it fitting for the Minister to make the sign on its Forehead, where you have besmear'd it with the dirt?*

---

# CHAP. XV.

## Quotations out of St. *Hierom* and St. *Austin*, before the rise of the *Pelagian* Controversie.

### *Sect.* 1. *out of St.* Hierom's *Letter to* Leta.

Year after the Apostles from 278 to 310.

THere was never nigh so much occasion given to mention the Baptism of Infants in Books and Writings, before *Pelagius* vented his Heresie against the Doctrine of original Sin, as there was after that Heresie was started: For as the Disputes about that Matter fill'd all the World, so the Arguments which the Catholicks drew from the Baptism of Infants for original Sin, and the *Pelagian*'s Answer to 'em, made a considerable part of those Disputes.

These two Fathers liv'd to see, and to bear a great part in the said Disputes; but they had each of 'em wrote several Books before that Controversie began. The Quotations out of their Tracts against the *Pelagians* will be best understood if put in a Chapter by themselves, together with some others out of *Pelagius* himself, and other Managers of the same Party, and ranked according to the order of time in which they were Written; for they were mostly Written by way of impleading and answering one another. I have therefore in this Chapter selected some passages out of such Writings of theirs as were before the said Controversie,

ſie, or did not at all relate to it: That the mixing of them may not diſturb the order of the other. Year after the Apoſtles 278.

## *Hieronymus Epiſt. ad Letam de Inſtitutione filiæ. Epiſt. 7.*

He is there admoniſhing that Lady of the charge that lay on her Conſcience to take care of the Education of her Child, and that God does require of Parents an account of the Child's Miſcarriage, if it happen by their fault, and ſays,

Eli *the Prieſt brought on himſelf the anger of God for the faults of his Children. He muſt not be a Biſhop that has Children riotous or unruly. On the other ſide it is* (1) *written of a Woman, that* ſhe ſhall be ſaved in [or, by] the Procreating of Children, if they ſhall continue in Faith, and Charity, and Holineſs with Modeſty. *If their adult age when they are at their own diſpoſe, be imputed to their Parents, how much more the time of their Infancy and tender Years, which, as the Scripture ſays, is not able to diſtinguiſh the right hand from the left,* i. e. *knows not the difference of Good and Evil?* Then follows this Objection. (1) 1 Tim 2. 15.

*Et quomodo, inquies, peccata parentum filiis non reddunturur, nec filiorum parentibus, ſed anima quæ peccaverit ipſa moritur?*

*Hoc de his dicitur qui poſſunt ſapere, de quibus in Evangelio ſcriptum eſt; Ætatem habet, loquatur pro ſe. Qui autem parvulus eſt & ſapit ut parvulus, donec ad annos ſapientiæ venit, & Pythagoræ litera* Y *eum perducat ad bivium; tam bona ejus quam mala parentibus imputantur. Niſi forte æſtimas Chriſtianorum filios, ſi baptiſma non receperint, ipſos tantum reos eſſe peccati; & non etiam ſcelus referri ad eos qui dare noluerint: maximè eo tempore quo contradiere non poterant qui accepturi erant. Sicut è regione [alia, ſic in regione vitæ] ſalus infantium majorum lucrum eſt.*

'And how then is it true, you'll ſay, that *the Sins of* '*the Fathers are not imputed to the Children, nor thoſe of the* '*Children to the Fathers, but the Soul that ſinneth, it ſhall* '*die?*

Year after the Apostles 278.

'This is said of those that have Understanding; of 'such as he was of whom it is Written in the Go-'spel, *He is of Age, let him speak for himself.* But he 'that is a Child, and thinks as a Child (till such time 'as he comes to years of Discretion, and *Pythagoras*'s 'Letter Y do bring him to the place where the road 'parts into two) his good Deeds, as well as his evil 'Deeds, are imputed to his Parents. Unless you will 'think that the Children of Christians are themselves 'only under the Guilt of the Sin, if they do not re-'ceive Baptism: And that the Wickedness is not im-'puted to those also who would not give it 'em; espe-'cially at that time when they that were to receive 'it could make no opposition against the receiving it. As 'also on the other side [or, as also in the Kingdom of 'Life] the Salvation of Infants is the advantage of 'their Parents.

278. Tho' St. *Hierom* calls himself an old Man in one part of this Epistle, yet it was Written a great while (30 years at least) before his Death, and consequently 20 years before *Pelagius* vented his new opinion. For he speaks here of *Eustochium*, who was this Lady's Husband's Sister, as a young Girl; and yet his Epistle to the said *Eustochium, de virginitate servandâ*, was Written 30 years before his Epistle to *Demetrias*, on the same Subject, as he himself observes in the latter.

His mentioning how great a Sin it would be in Christian Parents to neglect the Baptizing of their Infants, renders that improbable (which yet some Learned Men of late have supposed to be true) that his own Parents (who, as it seems, were Christians) had neglected the Baptizing him in Infancy: And that he was not Baptized till he came to *Rome*. Of which Opinion, and the Mistake on which it is grounded, I must say something, as also of some other such Instances, in a (2) Chapter on that Subject.

(2) Part. 2. CH. III.

## *Sect. 2. Out of St.* Austin's *Books de Sermone Domini in Monte.*

288. St. *Austin* was a Man of Note in the Church, and continued Writing of Books for 40 years and more. There never was any one Man whose Pains were so successful in healing the Wounds of the Church, caused

sed by Schisms and Heresies. His moderate and popu- Year after the
lar way of arguing had a great effect. Beside his wri- Apostles 288.
ting against the *Manichees*, of whom he had been one,
and some *Arians* that were then yet left; he had a main
hand in reducing the *Donatists*, and confuting the *Pe-*
*lagians*. These later began but 20 years before he di-
ed, *viz. Anno Dom.* 410. and he had Wrote several Books 310.
before they appeared. The Quotations that I shall pro-
duce at present are out of those former Books. One is
that which I briefly mention'd (3) before, *viz.* in his (3) CH. IV. and XI.

## *Lib.* 1. *de Sermone Domini in Monte, c.* 27.

He being there to explain that part of our Saviour's Ser- 293.
mon which forbids Divorce, takes occasion to cite
that advice of St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 7. 12. that a Christian
should not put away his Wife, tho' she as yet conti-
nued in Heathenism or Unbelief, and repeats the words
that follow in the Text, and gives his Paraphrase up-
on 'em, thus,

*Sanctificatus est enim, inquit, vir infidelis in uxore fideli: Et Sanctificata est mulier infidelis in fratre fideli.*

*Credo jam provenerat ut nonnullæ fæminæ per viros fideles, & viri per uxores fideles in fidem venirent: Et quamvis non dicens nomina, exemplis tamen exhortatus est ad confirmandum consilium suum. Deinde sequitur,*

*Alioquin filii vestri immundi essent, nunc autem sancti sunt.*

*Jam enim erant parvuli Christiani, qui sive authore uno ex parentibus, sive utroque consentiente sanctificati erant: Quod non fieret si uno credente dissociaretur conjugium, & non toleraretur infidelitas conjugum usque ad opportunitatem credendi.*

'For, *says he*, (4) an unbelieving Husband has been san- (4) 1 Cor. 7.
'ctified by his believing Wife; and an unbelieving 14.
'Wife by her believing Husband.

*I suppose it had then happen'd that several Wives had been brought to the Faith by their believing Husbands; and Husbands by their believing Wives. And tho' he does not mention their names, yet he makes use of their Example to confirm his advice. Then it follows,*

Else

Year after the Apostles 288. Else were your Children unclean, but now are they Holy.

*For there were then Christian Infants that were Sanctified* [or, made Holy, *i. e.* that were Baptized] *some by the Authority of one of their Parents, some by the Consent of both: Which would not be, if as soon as one Party believed the Marriage were dissolved, and the Infidelity of the Parties were not born with till there were an opportunity of believing.*

Here we see St. *Austin*'s Sense of that Expression of St. *Paul*, which has been of late the Subject of so much Debate. He judges St. *Paul*'s Meaning to be this, It is adviseable for a Christian Husband, whose Wife will not as yet own the Faith of Christ, not to put her away, because it is probable that he may in time gain her to the true Religion: Such Examples are by God's Grace very frequent. You commonly see the Unbelieving Party *Sanctified*, or brought to Faith and Baptism by the Believing one. Were it not so that the Faith of the one did generally prevail against the Infidelity of the other, the Children of such would be generally left in their unclean State, and be brought up to Heathenism; whereas we see now on the contrary that those of you that live in a State of Marriage with Unbelievers, do generally so far prevail by God's Grace, that *your Children are made Holy*, or Sanctified and Dedicated to the true God by Baptism.

If this Explication do seem remote to us now, it is because we do not so frequently as they did, use the word *Sanctification* and *Sanctified* for Baptism and Baptized. I believe it is not so little as a hundred times, that St. *Austin* for one, when he is to speak of Infants or other Persons, Baptized or to be Baptized, expresses it *Sanctified*, as we see he does here. If the Reader pleases, he may turn back to CH. XI. §. 9. where there is more said of that Matter. And by what I shall produce (5) hereafter, it will appear that most of the Ancients understood this Text as St. *Austin* does.

(5) CH. XIX. §. 19.

Sect.

## Sect. 3. out of St. *Austin's* Books of *Free-will.*

### *Augustinus de libero arbitrio lib.* 3. *c.* 23.

§. 1. This Treatise St. *Austin* wrote when he was a young Man, against the *Manichees* who maintain, that as there is one eternal Principle or God that made the Soul and all good Things, so there is another that has Created the Body, and is the Author of all Wickedness, and other Evils and Calamities; and that one of these comes from a necessary Principle as well as the other.

(6) Year after the Apostles 288.

(6) Aug. Retractat. l. 1. c. 9.

St. *Austin* shews that God created Man with a Free-will, and that all Sin comes from the ill use of that Free-will: And that all other Evils are Punishments for Sin, and that every one shall be judged according as he has either used that freedom of will to Good or abused it to Evil: And then adds,

*Some ignorant People make a slanderous Objection against this Doctrine, on account of Infants dying, and of the bodily Pains we often see them suffer: For they say,* 'To 'what purpose was such a one born, since he died be-'fore he merited any thing? Or what place shall he 'have in the future Judgment, who can't be among 'the Righteous because he never did any Good, nor 'among the Wicked, since he never Sinned? *To which we Answer, That in the Constitution of the Universe, and the fit Connexion of all the Creation in its Places and Times, no humane Person can have been Created without Reason, where not so much as the Leaf of a Tree is superfluously made. But that that is a superfluous Question which they put of the Merits of one that never merited any thing: For they need not fear that it should so happen, that there can be a life in a middle state between Good and Bad, and not a Sentence of the Judge in a middle way between Reward and Punishment.*

*Quo loco etiam illud persecrutari homines solent, Sacramentum Baptismi Christi quid parvulis prosit; cum eo accepto plerunque moriuntur priusquam ex eo quidquam cognoscere potuerunt. Quâ in re satis piè rectéque creditur prodesse parvulo eorum fidem à quibus consecrandus offertur.*

*Et*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*Et hoc Ecclesiæ commendat saluberrima autoritas, ut ex eo quisque sentiat quid sibi prosit fides sua, quando in aliorum quoque beneficium qui propriam nondum habent, potest aliena commodari. Quid enim profuit filio viduæ fides sua, quam utique mortuus non habebat? Cui tamen profuit matris, ut resurgeret.*

On which Head Men are wont to ask this Question also, 'What good the Sacrament of Christ's Baptism 'does to Infants? Whereas after they have received it, 'they often die before they are able to understand any 'thing of it. As to which matter it is piously and tru-'ly believed, that the Faith of those by whom the Child 'is offer'd to be Consecrated, profits the Child. And 'this the most sound Authority of the Church does 'commend, that hence every one may judge how pro-'fitable his own Faith will be to himself, when even 'another Person's Faith is useful for the advantage of 'those that have as yet none of their own. For how 'could the Widows Son (7) be holpen by his own 'Faith, whereof being dead he could have none? And 'yet his Mothers Faith was useful for his being rais'd to 'life again.

(7) Luke 7. 12.

328. §. 2. About 40 years after the Writing of this Book (when *Pelagianism* had in the mean time arisen and sunk again) some *Semipelagians* in *France*, who held still that Opinion of *Pelagius*, that Infants dying unbaptized shall, tho' they miss of the Kingdom of Heaven, yet live eternally without Punishment, made use of these Words of St. *Austin* to uphold their Tenet, as if he had therein express'd himself in favour of the Opinion of such a middle state.

Of this, and of other their Objections, one *Hilary* gives him notice by Letter. (8) *They plead*, says he, *that the Case of Infants is not to be made an Example for that of grown Persons. And even as to the Case of Infants: They say your Holiness so spoke of it as if you would have it counted an uncertain thing whether there be any Punishment for them: And the Negative to be more probable. And you may remember that in your* third Book concerning Free-will *your Words are such as might give them this occasion.*

(8) Epistolâ libro de prædestinatione Sanctorum præfixâ.

But St. *Austin* in Answer, (9) shews that they mistook what he spoke Hypothetically, and *ad hominem* against the *Manichees*, for a positive Speech. *Suppose*, says he, *that at that time when I began my Books of* Free-will, *being*

(9) Lib. de bono perseverantiæ. c. 12.

*being then but a Layman at* Rome, *or when I made an end of 'em, being then but a Presbyter in* Africa, *I had been unresolved of that point, that Infants not Regenerated are under Condemnation, and that those that are Regenerated are thereby freed from it. I hope there is no Man so unjust or envious as to be against my learning better.* Year after the Apostles 288.

*But whereas the truth is, that I ought not therefore to be thought to make any Question of that Matter, because I judg'd it fit to confute those against whom I disputed, in such a manner, that whether there be any Punishment for original Sin in Infants, as the truth is; or there be not, as some mistaken People think: Yet still that mixture of the natures of Good and Evil, which the* Manichees *fondly maintain, would have no reason to be believed. God forbid that I should leave the matter of Infants so, as to say it is uncertain whether those that are Regenerated in Christ, if they die in Infancy, do come to eternal Salvation; and those who are not Regenerated do fall into the second death. Whereas that which is written,* By (10) one Man Sin enter'd into the World, and Death by Sin, and so it past upon all Mankind, *can no otherwise be understood.* (10) Rom. 5. 12.

This Answer which he gives to the Reflections which the *Semipelagians* made upon these his first Writings may serve now for an Answer to that which *Grotius* has reflected on 'em in like manner: He says, (11) *That St.* Austin *before he was heated with the* Pelagian *disputes, never Wrote any thing of the Condemnation of unbaptiz'd Infants, not even to those lesser Pains in the World to come:* Intimating that he was not of that Opinion before. But supposing that were true that he did not in his former Writings mention that Matter, yet if we may believe him for his own Sense, it was not but that he understood the thing to be so at the time of Writing this Book: But he had not the same occasion to speak of it that he had afterward. (11) Annot. in Mat. 19. 14.

This he more plainly expresses in a Letter (12) to St. *Hierom* Written in the heat of the *Pelagian* Controversie, where having made mention of this Book and this Place; he says, *for in that Book I did make Answer concerning the Baptism of Infants,* non sufficienter, sed quantum illi operi satis videbatur; *not handling it fully, but as far as was needful in that Work; that it does profit even those that are not sensible of it, and have as yet no* (12) Epist. 28.

*Faith*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*Faith of their own. But I thought it not needful at that time to say any thing concerning the Condemnation of those Infants that depart this Life without it:* Quia non quod nunc agitur agebatur: *Because there was none of that dispute raised then, which is now.*

(13) Sect. 5. §. 6.

But I shall by and by (10) have occasion to shew that in other Pieces Written before the *Pelagian* times, he speaks of their Condemnation.

---

## Sect. 4. out of St. *Austin*'s Books against the *Donatists.*

### *Augustinus de Baptismo contra Donatistas. lib.* 4. *c.* 15.

300

§. 1. ST. *Austin* Wrote this Treatise, and many others against the *Donatists*, a party of Christians in *Africa*, who had made a Schism from the Church sometime before he was born, on the account of one *Cecilian* a Bishop, who, as they said, had in times of Persecution, under the Heathen Emperors, denied his Religion by giving up the Bible to be burnt, and yet afterward was suffer'd to continue and do the Office of a Bishop in the Church.

*Cecilian* denied the matter of Fact, and it could not be plainly prov'd: But these Men were so peremptory and so fierce against him, as not only to renounce him but also to renounce the Communion of the Church which suffer'd him to continue among them in his Office. And it came to such a heighth, that in St. *Austin*'s time their Party, which was very numerous, did so abhor the settled Church, that if any one who had been Baptized in the Church, came over to them they told him, the Baptism which he had received in so impure and defiled a Church, and from the hand of such Wicked Men, was null and void, and so they Baptized him anew. The Church did not so with them; but if any that had been Baptized by them came over to the Church, he was receiv'd as one whose Baptism was valid, tho' given by Schismaticks.

St. *Austin* manages thus, He shews the want of Proof of the Accusation by producing the Acts of Court and Records by which *Cecilian* had been acquitted. But besides, shews that suppose it were true, one is not to forsake a Church because of one or more wicked Men that are suffer'd in it. And particularly in this Treatise sets forth the impiety of their practice in re-baptizing. He shews that Baptism once given in the right form, *viz.* in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is valid: How Heretical or Impure soever the Church be in which, or how Wicked soever the Man be, from whose hands he receives it? [One may here note by the bye, that this rule of St. *Austin* does by the consent of most Ancients hold good, except in the Case of the *Paulianists*, who seem to have kept the Words of the form (tho' St. *Austin* had been inform'd otherwise) and yet their Opinion concerning Christ was so abhorr'd by the Christians that the Council of *Nice* order'd them to be re-baptiz'd, as I shall shew (14) hereafter]. He shews that Baptism is Christ's, and not the Minister's. And the validity thereof depends on God's Authority, not on the Goodness or Sincerity of the Person that Officiates, and consequently that those who had been Baptized by *Cecilian*, or any other Wicked Bishop, were to be accounted to have their Baptism valid: And the Priests ordained by him, were capable of giving Baptism to others.

Year after the Apostles 288.

(14) Part 2. CH. V. §. 7.

§. 2. He goes on to shew by the Example of *Simon Magus*, that Baptism received with a wicked Heart and Purpose (which is a worse Circumstance) is yet valid: And that such a Man is to repent of his Wickedness, but not to be Baptized again. And if a Man that is Baptized in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, have at that time some unsound Opinion concerning the Trinity or any Person thereof; he is to reform his Opinion, but not to renew his Baptism.

And he proves this by the Example of those who are Baptized young, when they have but an uncouth sense; or Infants, when they have no sense at all of the Articles of Faith, in these Words,

*Unde multi post baptismum proficientes, & maximè qui infantes vel pueri baptizati sunt, quanto magis intellectus eorum serenatur & illuminatur, dum inferior homo renovatur de die in diem, priores suas opiniones quas de Deo habebant, cùm suis phantasmatibus ludificarentur, irri-*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*irrident, & detestantes atque confitentes abjiciunt. Nec tamen ideo non accepisse baptismum existimantur, aut talem accepisse baptismum qualis fuit error ipsorum. Sed in eis & Sacramenti integritas honoratur, & mentis vanitas emendatur.*

'So that many Persons encreasing in knowledge after their Baptism, and especially those who have been Baptized either when they were Infants, or when they were Youths; as their Understanding is cleared and enlightned, and their *inward Man, renewed day by day*, do themselves deride, and with Abhorrence and Confession renounce the former Opinions which they had of God, when they were imposed on by their own Imaginations. And yet they are not therefore accounted either not to have received Baptism, or to have received a Baptism of that nature that their error was. But in their Case both the validity of the Sacrament is acknowledg'd, and the vanity of their Understanding rectified.

§. 3. And a little after, *c.* 23. He having had occasion to speak of the Penitent Thief, who obtained Salvation without Baptism, shews that that is no more an Argument against the necessity of Baptism, where it may be had, than the Example of baptized Infants obtaining Salvation without Faith, is an Argument against the necessity of Faith, where the Subject is capable of it. But that it is an Argument that one of these may be without the other; and so that Hereticks, who neither have nor do teach the right Faith, yet may give true baptism (if they give it in the right form) which ought not to be reiterated when the Party comes to the true Faith.

For that was one thing with which the *Donatists* upbraided the *Catholicks*, that they received Hereticks that came over to them, without giving 'em a new baptism.

He concludes this Fourth Book with these Words,

*Sicut autem in latrone, quia per necessitatem baptismus defuit, perfecta salus est; quia per pietatem spiritualiter affuit: Sic & cùm ipse præstò est, si per necessitatem desit quod latroni affuit, perficitur salus. Quod traditum tenet universitas ecclesiæ cùm parvuli infantes baptizantur; qui certè nondum possunt corde credere ad justitiam & ore confiteri ad salutem, quod latro potuit: Quinetiam flendo & vagiendo cùm in eis Mysterium celebratur, ipsis mysticis*

*mysticis vocibus obstrepunt. Et tamen nullus Christianorum dixerit eos inaniter baptizari.* Year after the Apostles 288.

*Et si quisquam in hâc re Divinam autoritatem quærat: Quanquam quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec Conciliis institutum sed semper retentum est, non nisi autoritate Apostolicâ traditum rectissimè creditur: Tamen veraciter conjicere possumus quid valeat in parvulis baptismi Sacramentum ex Circumcisione carnis quam prior populus accepit. Quam priusquam acciperet justificatus est Abraham, sicut Cornelius etiam dono spiritûs sancti priusquam baptizaretur ditatus est: Dicit tamen Apostolus de ipso Abraham; signum accepit Circumcisionis, signaculum fidei justitiæ quâ jam corde crediderat & deputatum ei erat ad justitiam. Cur ergo ei præceptum est ut omnem deinceps infantem masculum octavo die circumcideret, qui nondum poterat corde credere ut ei deputaretur ad justitiam, nisi quia & ipsum per seipsum Sacramentum multùm valebat?* ——— *Sicut ergo in Abraham præcessit fidei justitia, & accessit circumcisio signaculum justitiæ fidei: Ita in Cornelio præcessit sanctificatio spiritalis in dono spiritûs sancti, & accessit sacramentum regenerationis in lavacro baptismi. Et sicut in Isaac qui octavo suæ nativitatis die circumcisus est, præcessit signaculum justitiæ fidei: Et (quoniam patris fidem imitatus est) secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia cujus signaculum in infante præcesserat. Ita & in baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacramentum, & (si Christianam tenuerint pietatem) sequitur in corde conversio, cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore. Et sicut in illo latrone quod ex baptismi sacramento defuerat complevit Omnipotentis benignitas, quia non superbiâ vel contemptu sed necessitate defuerat: Sic in infantibus qui baptizati moriuntur eadem gratia Omnipotentis implere credenda est, quòd non ex impiâ voluntate sed ex ætatis indigentiâ nec credere ad justitiam possunt nec ore confiteri ad salutem. Ideo cum alii pro eis respondeant, ut impleatur erga eos celebratio sacramenti; valet utique ad eorum consecrationem: Quia ipsi respondere non possunt. At si pro eo qui respondere potest alius respondeat, non itidem valet.* ——— *Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur aliud esse sacramentum baptismi, aliud conversionem cordis; sed salutem hominis ex utroque compleri: Nec si unum horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse ut alterum desit; qui & illud sine isto potest esse in infantibus, & hoc sine illo potuit esse in latrone: Complente Deo sive in illo sive in isto quod non ex voluntate defuerat: Cùm vero*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*ex voluntate alterum horum defuerit, reatu hominem involvi.*

*Et baptismus quidem potest inesse ubi conversio cordis defuerit: Conversio autem cordis potest quidem inesse non percepto baptismo; sed contempto baptismo non potest: Neque enim ullo modo dicenda est conversio cordis ad Deum, cum Dei Sacramentum contemnitur.*

*Justè igitur reprehendimus, anathematizamus, detestamur, abominamur perversitatem cordis hæreticorum: Sacramentum tamen Evangelicum non ideo non habent, quia per quod utile est non habent. Quapropter cum ad fidem & veritatem veniunt, & agentes pœnitentiam remitti sibi peccata deposcunt; non eos decipimus, neque fallimus, cùm correctos à nobis ac reformatos in eo quo depravati atque perversi sunt, ad regnum cœlorum sic disciplinis cœlestibus erudimus, ut quod in eis integrum est nullo modo violemus: Nec propter hominis vitium, si quid in homine Dei est vel nullum vel vitiosum esse dicamus.*

'And as the Thief, who by necessity went without 'baptism, was saved; because by his Piety he had it 'spiritually: So where baptism is had, tho' the Party 'by necessity go without that [*Faith*] which the Thief 'had, yet he is saved.

'Which the *whole body of the Church* holds, as deliver-'ed to 'em, in the Case of little Infants baptized: Who 'certainly cannot yet believe with the heart to Righ-'teousness, or confess with the Mouth to Salvation, as 'the Thief could; nay, by their crying and noise while 'the Sacrament is administring, they disturb the Holy 'Mysteries: And yet *no Christian Man* will say they are 'baptized to no purpose.

'And if any one do ask for Divine Authority in this 'Matter: Tho' that which the *whole* Church practises 'and which has not been instituted by Councils, but 'was ever in use, is very reasonably believed to be no 'other than a thing deliver'd [*or order'd*] by Authori-'ty of the Apostles: Yet we may besides take a true 'estimate, how much the Sacrament of baptism does a-'vail Infants, by the Circumcision which God's former 'People received.

'For *Abraham* was justified before he received that, as 'Cornelius was endued with the holy Spirit before he 'was baptiz'd, and yet the Apostle says of *Abraham* 'That he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the 'Righteousness of the Faith, by which he had in heart

'believed

'believed, *and it had been counted to him for Righteousness.* Year after the Apostles 288.
'Why then was he Commanded thenceforward to circum-
'cise all his male Infants on the eighth day, when they
'could not yet believe with the heart that it might be
'counted to them for Righteousness, but for this reason
'because the Sacrament it self is of it self of great im-
'port? —— Therefore as in *Abraham* the Righteous-
'ness of Faith went before, and Circumcision the Seal
'of the Righteousness of Faith came after; so in *Cor-*
'*nelius* the spiritual Sanctification by the gift of the
'holy Spirit went before, and the Sacrament of Regenera-
'tion by the laver of baptism came after. And as in
'*Isaac* who was Circumcised the eighth day, the Seal
'of the Righteousness of Faith went before, and (as
'he was a follower of his Father's Faith) the Righte-
'ousness it self, the Seal whereof had gone before in his
'Infancy, came after: So in Infants baptized the Sacra-
'ment of Regeneration goes before, and (if they put in
'practice the Christian Religion) Conversion of the
'heart, the Mystery whereof went before in their body,
'comes after.

'And as in that Thief's Case, what was wanting of
'the Sacrament of baptism the Mercy of the Almighty
'made up; because it was not out of Pride or Contempt
'but of necessity that it was wanting: So in Infants
'that die after they are baptiz'd, it is to be believ'd that
'the same Grace of the Almighty does make up that de-
'fect, that by reason, not of a wicked Will, but of
'want of Age, they can neither believe with the Heart
'to Righteousness, nor confess with the mouth unto Sal-
'vation. So that when others answer for them, that
'they may have this Sacrament given 'em; it is valid
'for their Consecration, because they cannot answer for
'themselves: But if for one that is able to answer
'himself, another should answer, it would not be
'valid. ——By all which it appears that the Sacrament
'of baptism is one thing, and Conversion of the heart
'another: But that the Salvation of a Person is com-
'pleated by both of 'em, And if one of these be want-
'ing, we are not to think that it follows, that the other
'is wanting; since one may be without the other in an
'Infant, and the other was without that in the Thief:
'God Almighty making up both in one and the other case
'that which was not wilfully wanting.

Year after the Apostles 288.

'But when either of these is wilfully wanting, it involves the Person in Guilt. And baptism indeed may 'be had where Conversion of the Heart is wanting; 'but Conversion of the Heart, tho' it may be where 'baptism is not had, cannot be where it is contemned: For that is by no means to be called Conversion of the Heart to God, where the Sacrament of 'God is contemned.

'Well may we therefore reprehend, anathematize, 'detest and abhor the perversion of Heart that is in Heretics: But yet we must not say that they therefore 'have not the Gospel-sacrament, because they have not 'that which should make it useful to 'em.

'Therefore when they come to the true Faith, and 'being Penitent, do desire that their faults may be 'pardoned; we do not deceive or cheat 'em, when 'correcting and reforming in them that wherein they 'were depraved and perverted, we do instruct 'em with 'holy Discipline for the Kingdom of Heaven in such 'a manner, as that we do by no means violate that in 'them which is valid: Nor for the fault of the Man say 'that that which is of God in the Man is either null or 'faulty.

§. 4. I have Transcribed this Passage the larger, because Mr. *Danvers*, who had set up a pretence that the *Donatists* found fault with the *Catholicks* for baptizing Infants, would prove it from this Place. He had (15) said, *That* Austin's *third and fourth Books against the* Donatists *do demonstrate that they denied Infants baptism: Wherein he manages the Argument for Infants baptism against them with great Zeal, enforcing it by several Arguments, but especially from Apostolical Tradition; and cursing with great bitterness they that would not embrace it.* And when his Answerers jog'd him, and told him, That in the third Book there was never a word about it; he said the fourth Book did however shew it. And yet in the fourth Book there is nothing but what I here produce. And any one that can give any tolerable guess at the Sence of what he reads, sees by this and the rest of the Book, that St. *Austin* does not here argue against the *Donatists*, as if they denied Infant baptism But proves that baptism received from the hands of heretical or depraved Priests is valid, tho' they give the baptized Person a wrong Account of the Faith, by this reason, that Infants baptism is valid, tho' they have a yet

(15) Treatise of Bapt. Pt. 2. CH. VII. p. 223.

yet no Account of Faith at all. And I have already (16) shewn from *Optatus*, that the *Catholicks* and *Donatists* had no difference about the nature of baptism, or way of administring it; but only about the Purity or Orthodoxy of the Persons that gave it: And shall by and by (17) have occasion to shew particularly that they baptized Infants as well as the Catholicks.

Year after the Apostles 288.

(16) CH. VIII. §. 1.

(17) CH. XVI. §. 1, 2.

But what does he mean by saying, *That St.* Austin *Curst*, &c.

The *Donatists* reproach'd the Catholicks for receiving to their Communion such as had been baptized among Hereticks, as *Arians*, *Appollinarists*, &c. without giving them, upon their coming to the Communion of the Church, a new baptism: As if they thereby owned Communion with such Hereticks, or approved their Doctrine. St. *Austin* answers, as we see, *We do* [as well as you] *reprehend, anathematize*, &c. *the perversion of heart*, [or, false Doctrine] *of the Hereticks: But yet we must not therefore say, that they have not the Sacrament*, &c. This is what this Man, who could find Antipædobaptism in every Latin Book that he look'd into, calls, *Cursing they that would not embrace Infant baptism.*

Mr. *Baxter* says on this occasion, (18) *Either this Man had seen and read these Books of St.* Austin, *or he had not. If not, does he use God's Church, and the Souls of poor ignorant People with any tenderness*, &c? *If he understand not* Latin, *how unfit is he to give us the History of these Antiquities*, &c? *But if he have read 'em, then I can scarce match him among all the falsifiers I know in the World. I dare not be so uncharitable to him as to think that he ever read 'em.* But to leave him, and go on;

(18) Confutation of the strange Forgeries of Mr. H. D. Sect. 2. CH. IV. §. 7.

Tho' St. *Austin* speak of Infant baptism in this place but by the bye, his words are, we see, a full evidence that it was then *universally* practis'd, and had been so beyond the Memory of any Man, or of any Record: That they took it to be a thing that had not been *enacted by any Council*, but had *ever been in use* from the beginning of Christianity. And they had then but 300 years to look back to the times of the Apostles, whereas we now have 1600. And the Writings and Records which are now lost, were then extant, and easily known.

Year after the Apostles 288.

Moreover, for the Sorts or Sects of Christians that were then; he says that *nullus Christianorum, none of all the Christians* (and then certainly not the *Donatists* with whom he was talking) had any other Opinion but that it was useful or necessary.

This is to be understood with a limitation, which I shall shew (19) that he expresses elsewhere, provided they were such as made use of any baptism at all: For there were some Sects that called themselves Christians, (but they were hardly allowed that name by any others) who utterly refused the use of any Baptism at all. Of whom I shall give some account at a place (19) convenient.

(19) Part. 2. CH. V. §. 1.

---

## Sect. 5. Out of St. *Austin's* Letter to *Boniface.*

### *Augustini Epistola ad Bonifacium Episcopum Epist.* 23.

308.

§. 1. BOniface, a Bishop of St. *Austin's* Acquaintance, had wrote to him to desire his Explication of two Matters that appeared to him difficult to resolve. They do both relate to Infants baptism.

One was, *Whether such Parents do their Infants that are baptized any hurt, who carry 'em to the Heathen Temples and Sacrifices to be cured by those Impious Rites of some infirmity they have. And if they hereby do 'em no hurt, then how it comes to pass, that the Faith of the Parents stands 'em in stead when they are baptized, and yet the Apostacy of their Parents does 'em no hurt.*

The other was, how that can be reconcil'd to Truth which the God-father answers in the Child's name at baptism: *viz.* That *he does believe; does renounce; will obey,* &c. when he at present has no Sence at all, and what he will have hereafter, no body knows.

A part of what St. *Austin* answers to the first of these I have already recited in the (20) Chapter of St. *Cyprians* sayings: Because he does in this answer cite and explain one of the Passages of *Cyprian,* which I had there cited

(20) CH. VI. §. 12.

cted. And another part of it in *CH. III.* §. 4. because it gives a full proof that the Ancients took the Word *Regeneration* for Baptism exclusively of all other Senses. Year after the Apostles 288.

The Substance of the Answer is, that original Sin is is at first derived from the Parents to the Child, because the Child is at first a part of the Parents: That after he is become a separate living Person, the Faith of the Parents, or others that bring him to Baptism is available to him, because *the Regenerating Spirit is* one *in the grown Persons that bring the Child, and in the Child that is brought: But when the same grown Persons commit that Wickedness on the Child, offering him, and endeavouring to engage him in the sacrilegious bonds of Devils; there is not then* one Soul *in both of 'em, that the Crime should be Communicated. For Sin is not so Communicated by the will of another which is distinct, as Grace is Communicated by the holy Spirit which is one and the same. For the same holy Spirit may be in this and in that Person, altho' they mutually know it not one of another, and so the Grace may be common: But the Spirit of a human Person cannot be in this and in that Person; so that one sinning and the other not sinning the guilt should be common.*

## Some remaining parts of the Answer relating to some particular things that *Boniface* had said do here follow.

*Nec illud te moveat, quòd quidem non eâ fide ad baptismum percipiendum parvulos ferunt ut gratiâ spiritali ad vitam regenerentur æternam, sed quòd eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere vel recipere sanitatem. Non enim propterea illi non regenerantur quia non ab istis hâc intentione offeruntur. Celebrantur enim per eos necessaria ministeria, &c.——Spiritus autem ille sanctus qui habitat in sanctis, ex quibus una illa columba deargentata Charitatis igne conflatur, agit quod agit etiam per servitutem aliquando non solùm simpliciter ignorantium, verùm etiam damnabiliter indignorum. Offeruntur quippe parvuli ad percipiendam spiritalem gratiam non tam ab eis quorum gestantur manibus, quamvis & ab ipsis si & ipsi boni fideles sunt, quàm ab universâ societate sanctorum atque fidelium. Ab omnibus namque offerri rectè intelliguntur quibus placet quòd offerantur, & quorum sanctâ atque indivi-*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*duâ charitate ad communicationem sancti spiritûs adjuvantur. Tota hoc ergo mater Ecclesia quæ in sanctis est, facit; quia tota omnes, tota singulos parit. Nam si Christiani baptismi sacramentum quod unum atque idipsum est, etiam apud hæreticos valet ad consecrationem, quamvis ad vitæ æternæ participationem non sufficiat: Quæ consecratio reum quidem facit hæreticum extra Domini gregem habentem Dominicum characterem; corrigendum tamen admonet sana Doctrina, non iterum similiter consecrandum: Quanto votius in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ etiam per stipulæ ministerium frumenta purganda portantur, ut ad massæ societatem mediante areâ perducantur?*

*Illud autem nolo te fallat, ut existimes reatûs vinculum ex Adam tractum aliter non posse dirumpi nisi parvuli ad percipiendam Christi gratiam à parentibus offerantur. Sic enim scribens dicis; ut sicut parentes autores fuerunt ad eorum pœnam, per fidem parentum identidem justificentur. Cum videas multos non offerri à parentibus, sed etiam à quibuslibet extraneis: Sicut à dominis servuli aliquando offeruntur; & nonnunquam mortuis parentibus suis parvuli baptizantur ab eis oblati qui in illis hujusmodi misericordiam præbere potuerunt. Aliquando etiam quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt nutriendos à quibuslibet nonnunquam à sacris virginibus colliguntur, & ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum quæ certè proprios filios non habuerunt ullos nec habere disponunt.*

§. 2. *Let not that disturb you, that* some People do not 'bring their Infants to Baptism with that Faith [or pur-'pose] that they may by spiritual Grace be regenerated 'to eternal Life, but because they think they do procure 'or preserve their bodily health by this remedy. For 'the Children do not therefore fail of being Regenerated, 'because they are not brought by the others with this 'intention. For the necessary Offices are performed by 'them, &c.——— And the holy Spirit that dwells in the 'Saints, out of whom that silver Dove that is but one, 'is by the fire of Charity compacted, does what he 'does sometimes by the means of Men not only simply 'ignorant, but also damnably unworthy. For Infants are 'offer'd for the receiving of the spiritual Grace, not so 'much by those in whose hands they are brought, (tho' 'by those too if they be good faithful Christians) as by 'the whole Congregation of Saints, and faithful Men. 'For they are rightly said to be offer'd by all those whose 'desire it is that they should be offer'd, and by whose holy

'and

'and united Charity they are assisted towards the Com-'munication of the Holy Spirit.

'So that the whole Church of the Saints does this Of-'fice as a Mother. For the whole Church brings forth 'all her Children, and the whole brings forth each parti-'cular.

'For if the Sacrament of Christian baptism, which is 'one and the same, be available even among Hereticks 'for the Consecration of a Person, tho' it be not suffici-'ent for his obtaining of eternal Life (which Consecrati-'on involves the Heretick in the guilt of Sin for using '*the Lord's Mark* without the compass of the *Lord's Flock*: 'And yet the Orthodox Doctrine teaches that such a 'Person is to be reformed, but not to be Consecrated 'anew). How much more in the Catholick Church may 'the Corn that is to be cleaned, be brought in by the 'means of the Straw, that by the help of the floor, it 'may be gathered to the rest of the heap?

'§. 3. But I would not have you mistake so as to think 'that the bond of Guilt deriv'd from *Adam* cannot be 'broken, unless the Children be offer'd for receiving the 'Grace of Christ by their own Parents. For so you speak 'in your Letter, *That as the Parents were Authors of their 'Punishment, so they may also by the Faith of their Parents 'be justified.*

'Whereas you see that a great many are offer'd not 'by their Parents, but by any other Persons. As the In-'fant Slaves are sometimes offer'd by their Masters: And 'sometimes when the Parents are dead, the Infants are 'baptiz'd, being offer'd by any that can afford to shew 'this Compassion on 'em. And sometimes Infants whom 'their Parents have cruelly expos'd, to be brought up by 'those that light on 'em, are now and then taken up by 'the holy Virgins, and offer'd to baptism by them who have 'no Children of their own, nor design to have any. And 'in all this there is nothing else done than what is Writ-'ten in the Gospel, when our Lord ask'd who was Neigh-'bour to him that was wounded by Thieves, and left 'half dead in the Road? And it was answer'd, *He that 'shew'd mercy on him.*

Here we see (beside the resolution of the main Question, both *Boniface* and St. *Austin* taking it for granted that Infants are to be baptiz'd) that the ordinary use then was for the Parents to answer for their Children: But yet that this was not counted so necessary as that

a Child

Year after the Apostles 288.

a Child could not be baptiz'd without that Circumstance. Any one that was on any equitable account owner of the Child might bring it to baptism.

Neither did the baptism depend on the Holiness, or right Faith, or intention of those that brought the Child. It was suppos'd to be done by the order and at the desire of the Church, and particularly of those that assisted with their Prayers at the Office.

§. 4. He next proceeds to speak of the other question put by *Boniface.*

*Difficillimam sanè quæstionem tibi proposuisse visus es in extremo inquisitionis tuæ; eâ videlicet intentione quâ soles vehementer cavere mendacium. Si constituam, inquis, ante te parvulum, & interrogem utrùm cum creverit, futurus sit castus, vel fur non sit futurus: Sine dubio respondebis; nescio. Et utrùm in eadem parvulâ ætate constitutus cogitet aliquid boni vel mali dices, Nescio. Si itaque de moribus ejus futurus nihil audes certi promittere, & de præsenti ejus cogitatione: Quid est illud quod quando ad baptismum offeruntur, pro eis parentes tanquam fide dictores respondent & dicunt illos facere quod illa ætas cogitare non potest; & si potest, occultum est. Interogamus enim eos à quibus offeruntur, & dicimus; Credit in Deum? de illâ ætate quæ utrùm sit Deus ignorat. Respondet, Credit: Et ad cætera sic respondetur singula quæ geruntur. Unde miror parentes in istis rebus tam fidenter pro parvulo respondere, ut dicant eum tanta bona facere quæ ad horam quâ baptizatur, baptizator interrogat: Tamen eâdem horâ si subjiciam; erit castus qui baptizatur? Aut, non erit fur? Nescio utrùm audet dicere aliquis, Aliquid horum erit, vel, non erit; sicut mihi sine dubitatione respondet quod Credat in Deum, & quod se convertat ad Deum.*

*Deinde scripta tua concludens adjungis & dicis; ad istas ergo quæstiones peto breviter respondere digneris, ita ut non mihi de consuetudine præscribas, sed rationem reddas.*

*His literis tuis lectis & relectis, & quantum temporis angustiæ sinebant consideratis, recordatus sum Nebridium amicum meum: Qui cum esset rerum obscurarum, ad doctrinam pietatis maximè pertinentium, diligentissimis & acerrimus inquisitor, valdè oderat de quæstione magnâ responsionem brevem: Et quisque hoc poposcisset, ægerrimè ferebat: Eumque, si ejus persona pateretur, vultu indignabundus & voce cohibebat: Indignum deputans qui talia quæreret, cum de re tantâ quam multa dici possent deberentque nesciret. Sed ego tibi non similiter ut solebat ille, succen-*

*seo.*

*sco. Es enim Episcopus multis curis occupatus, ut ego: Unde nec tibi facilè vacat prolixum aliquid legere nec mihi scribere. Nam ille tunc adolescens, qui talia breviter nolebat audire, & multa in nostrâ sermocinatione quærebat, & ab ocioso quærebat ociosus. Tu vero cogitans nunc quis & à quo ista flagites, breviter de re tantâ respondere me jubes. Ego facio quantum possum: Dominus adjuvet, ut quod postulas possim.*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut Pascha propinquante dicamus crastinam vel perendinam esse Domini Passionem; cùm ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel ista passio facta sit. Nempe ipso die Dominico dicimus. Hodie Dominus resurrexit: Cum ex quo resurrexit tot anni transierint. Cur nemo tam ineptus est ut nos ita loquentes arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies secundum illorum quibus hæc gesta sunt similitudinem nuncupamus? Ut dicatur ipse dies qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus: Et dicatur illo die fieri propter sacramenti celebrationem, quod non illo die sed jam olim factum est. Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? Et tamen in sacramento non solùm per omnes Paschæ solennitates, sed omni die populis immolatur. Nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quædam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hâc autem similitudine plerunque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt.*

*Sicut ergo secundùm quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est; ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Nihil est autem aliud credere quàm fidem habere. Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulus credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum; respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, & convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum: Quia & ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. Sicut de ipso baptismo Apostolus; Consepulti, inquit, sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem. Non ait; sepulturam significamus: Sed prorsus ait; Consepulti sumus. Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit.*

*Itaque parvulum etsi nondum fides illa quæ in credentium voluntate consistit, jam tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum fidelem facit. Nam sicut credere respondetur, sic etiam fidelis vocatur, non [ad] rem ipsam Mente annuendo, sed ipsius rei sacramentum percipiendo. Cum autem homo sapere cœperit, non illud sacramentum repetit, sed intelligit: e-*

*jusque*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*jusque veritati consonâ etiam voluntate coaptabitur. Hoc quamdiu non potest, valebit sacramentum ad ejusdem tutelam adversus contrarias potestates: Et tantum valebit, ut si ante rationis usum ex hâc vitâ emigraverit, per ipsum sacramentum, commendante ecclesiæ charitate, ab illâ condemnatione quæ per unum hominem intravit in mundum, Christiano adjutorio liberetur. Hoc qui non credit, & fieri non posse arbitratur, profecto infidelis est, etsi habeat fidei sacramentum: longeque melior est ille parvulus qui etiamsi fidem nondum habeat in cogitatione, non ei tamen obicem contrariæ cogitationis opponit; unde sacramentum ejus salubriter percipit.*

*Respondi sicut existimo quæstionibus tuis quantum attinet ad minùs capaces & contentiosos non satis, quantum autem ad pacatos & intelligentes plus fortè quam sat est. Nec tibi ad excusationem meam objeci firmissimam consuetudinem, sed saluberrimæ consuetudinis reddidi quam potui rationem.*

*You reckon you have propos'd a very hard question in the latter part of your Letter, according to that temper of yours by which you are wont to be exceeding cautious of any thing that looks like a lie. You say thus;*

'Suppose I set before you an Infant, and ask you 'whether, when he grows up, he will be a Chast Man, 'or, whether he will be no Thief? Your answer doubt-'less will be, *I cannot tell.* And, whether he in that In-'fant Age have any good or evil Thought: You will 'say, *I know not.* Since therefore you dare not say any 'thing either concerning his future Behaviour, or his pre-'sent Thoughts: What is the meaning that when they 'are brought to Baptism, their Parents, as Sponsors for 'them, make answer and say, That they do that which 'that Age can have no thoughts of; or if they have, no 'body knows what they are? For we ask those by whom 'they are brought, and say, *Does he believe in God?* Con-'cerning that Age which has no knowledge whether 'there be a God or not: They answer, *He does believe:* 'And so in like manner answer is made to all the rest. 'So that I wonder how the Parents do in those Mat-'ters answer so confidently for the Child that he does this 'or that good thing, which the baptizer demands at the 'time of his Baptism: And yet if at the same time I ask, '*Will this baptized Person prove Chaste*, or, *not prove a Thief?* 'I question whether any one dare so answer, *He will*, or, '*will not be such or such a one*; as they answer without any

'hesitation

'hesitation that *he does believe in God: He does turn to* Year after the Apostles 288
'*God.*

*And then you conclude your Letter with these Words,*

'*I entreat you to give me a short answer to these questi-*
'*ons in such a manner as that you do not urge to me the*
'*Prescription of the Customariness of the thing, but give me*
'*the reason of it.*

'When I had read your Letter over and over, and
'had consider'd it as far as my short time would allow;
'it made me call to mind my Friend *Nebridius*, who be-
'ing a very diligent and sagacious inquirer into Matters
'that were obscure, especially such as concern'd Religion,
'could not endure a short answer to a weighty question,
'and took it very ill if any one desir'd such a thing; and
'would with an angry voice and look reprimand him, if
'he were a Person that might be so us'd, as counting
'him unfit to ask such questions; who did not consider
'how much might and ought to be said on so great a
'Matter.

'But, I do not pretend to be angry with you in such
'manner as he was wont to be: For you are a Bishop
'that have a great many cares upon you, as well as I: So
'that neither have you the leisure to read a long Dis-
'course, nor I to write one. For he being then a young
'Man that would not be answer'd in brief to such things,
'but spent a great deal of talk with me, inquired as one
'at leisure from one that was so too. But you, consider-
'ing now your own Circumstances that ask, and mine
'that am asked, bid me answer briefly about so great a
'Matter. And that I here do as well as I can: I pray
'God to assist me that I may be able to satisfie your
'demand.

'You know we often express our selves so, as that
'when *Good Friday* is nigh, we say, *To morrow*, or, *next*
'*day is our Lord's passion*: Tho' it be a great many years
'ago that he suffer'd, and his Passion was never perfor-
'med but once. So on the *Lord's day* we say, *This day*
'*our Lord arose*, tho' since he arose it be so many years.
'Why is there no body so silly as to say we lie when we
'speak so, but for this reason, because we give names to those
'days, from the Representation they make us of those on
'which the things were indeed done? So as that is call'd the
'very day, which is not the very day, but answers to it in the
'Revolution of time: And that which is not done on that
'day, but was done a long time ago, is spoken of as done on

'that

Year after the Apostles 288.

'that day, because the Sacrament of it is then celebrated. 'Was not Christ in his own Person offer'd up [*or, sacrificed*] once for all? And yet in the Sacrament he is offer'd in the Church [*or, in, or, to, or among the people*] not 'only every *Easter*, but every day; nor does he lie, who 'being ask'd, says, *He is offer'd.* For Sacraments would 'not be Sacraments, if they had not a resemblance of those 'things whereof they are the Sacraments: And from this 'resemblance they commonly have the names of the 'things themselves.

'As therefore the Sacrament of Christ's body is after 'a certain fashion Christ's body, and the Sacrament of 'Christ's blood is Christ's blood: So the Sacrament of 'Faith is Faith, and to believe is nothing else but to have 'Faith. And so when an Infant that has not yet the faculty of Faith, is said to believe; he is said to have Faith, 'because of the Sacrament of Faith; and to turn to God, 'because of the Sacrament of Conversion: Because that 'answer belongs to the Celebration of the Sacrament. So 'the Apostle on this same Subject of Baptism, says, (21) '*We are buried together with Christ by Baptism unto Death:* 'He does not say, *We signific a burial*, but he uses the 'word it self, *We are buried.* So that he calls the Sacrament of so great a thing by the name of the thing 'it self.

(21) Rom. 6. 4.

'And so an Infant, tho' he be not yet Constituted *a Fidel* [*a faithful Christian*] by that Faith which consists 'in the will of believers; yet he is by the Sacrament of 'that Faith: For as he is said *to believe*, so he is called '*a Fidel*, not from his having the thing it self in his 'mind, but from his receiving the Sacrament of it.

'And when a Person begins to have a Sense of things 'he does not repeat that Sacrament, but understands 'the force of it, and by consent of Will squares himself 'to the true meaning of it. And till he can do this, the 'Sacrament will avail to his preservation against all 'contrary powers: And so far it will avail; that if he 'depart this Life before the use of reason, he will by 'this Christian remedy of the Sacrament it self (the 'Charity of the Church recommending him) be made 'free from that *Condemnation* (22) *which by one Man entered into the World.*

(22) Rom. 5. 18.

'He

'He that does not believe this, and thinks it cannot be done, is indeed an Infidel, tho' he have the Sacrament of Faith. And that Infant is much better, who tho' he have not Faith in his Mind, yet puts no bar of a contrary Mind against it, and so receives the Sacrament to his Souls health. Year after the Apostles 288.

'I have given such an answer to your questions, as I suppose is, to ignorant or contentious People not enough, and to understanding and quiet People perhaps more than enough. Neither have I, to spare my Pains, urged to you the Custom's being so firmly grounded: But I have, as well as I could, explained to you the reason of that wholesome Custom.

How skilful or judicious the Reader will judge this Explication of the reason of the Custom to be, I know not? Nor is it much material, since we are not now inquiring how acute St. *Austin* was, but what it was that he and the rest knew to be true in point of Fact. And hereby we perceive plainly these Matters following.

§. 5. 1. That that was the practice, for the Godfathers (who were, as I said, usually the Parents) to make these answers in the Child's name. The use of Godfathers appeared before (23) from the words of *Tertullian*; but here it is set forth more particularly: And St. *Austin* says that these *Answers, do belong to* [or, are a necessary appertinence of] *the Sacrament*, and he had said in the former part of the Letter, (which I omitted because of the length) that they are *verba Sacramentorum, sine quibus parvulus consecrari non potest: Words of the Sacrament, without which an Infant cannot be baptized.* Whether he would not have excepted the case of necessity in danger of sudden Death (as the Church of *England* does) if there had been occasion of speaking of that, I know not: But it is plain he would have been against those that either decry this practice, or count it a thing of no moment. The Church of Christ has always taken care that the Blessings of God promised in this Sacrament may be understood as conveyed conditionally or by way of Covenant; which these questions and answers do most lively express. (23) CH. IV. §. 9.

§. 6. 2. We see that they then held as *certain, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly saved*: For St. *Austin* here says in these last Words that *he that does not believe this is an Infidel*: Which he would not say, if it had been counted

Year after the Apostles 288.

ed at all doubtful. The same thing might have been observ'd from what he says above; *Sect.* 3. §. 2. *God forbid that I should make any question whether Infants regenerated and dying in Infancy do come to eternal Salvation.*

3. If those Learned *Benedictines* who have managed the last Edition of this Father's Works, to set his Books and Epistles in their Chronological Order, have placed this Epistle right; then we see here another proof of the mistake of *Grotius*, who maintains, as I (24) said, that St. *Austin*, before he was heated with the *Pelagian* Controversie, did never assert the Condemnation of Infants dying unbaptized, no not to those lesser or milder sufferings in the World to come. For they place this Epistle, (which is in their Edition the 98th) *Anno Dom.* 408. which was before *Pelagius* vented his Heresie: And yet here St. *Austin* in saying, *They will, if they die before the use of reason, be freed by this Christian remedy of the Sacrament from that Condemnation which by one Man enter'd into the World*, plainly supposes that they would otherwise have been liable to it.

(24) Annot. in Matt. 19. 14.

(24) Sect. 3. §. 2.

§. 7. 4. There are two other things observable from his Words here, which are well worth the noting, tho' they do not relate to our Subject. One is, that he speaks so as that we may be sure he had no notion of Transubstantiation. For to say, that *Sacraments have a likeneß* [or resemblance] *of those things whereof they are the Sacraments; and from this resemblance they commonly have the names of the things themselves*; and to exemplifie this by saying, *The Sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body, and the Sacrament of his blood is his blood after a certain manner* [or fashion] and to speak of this as a thing so understood by all, is proof enough that he neither believed, nor had conceived or heard of any such doctrine as makes the body and blood of Christ to be there in a proper sense.

§. 8. 5. Another is, that it was then the common Custom for Christians in some Churches, and probably in that where he lived, to receive the Communion of Christ's body every day. For so he says, *Christ in himself* [or, in his own Person] *was offer'd* [or, sacrificed] *but once: but yet in the Sacrament* [or, in a Sacramental way] *he is offer'd up every day.* 'Tis certain this was the Custom then of the Christians at *Rome*: And that in many of the *Eastern* Churches, and some of the *Western* the Custom was not

to

not to receive so often. For St. *Hierom* and St. *Austin* have each of 'em written Letters on this Subject in answer to some that had desir'd their opinion in relation to this difference, as *Aug. Epist.* 118. *ad Januarium. Hieronym. Epist.* 28. *ad Lucinum Bæticum.* See also *Aug. de sermone Domini in Monte. l.* 2. *c.* 12. and *Gennad. de Eccl. dogm. c.* 63. Their Opinion is, that in that and all such like *Matters that are not determined by Scripture, nor by the Authority of the Universal Church, one should follow the usage of that Church in which one lives.* And St. *Austin* there says, that he had by long Experience found this Rule (which had been given him by St. *Ambrose*) to be of unspeakable use for the quieting Mens minds, and for the Peace of the Church.

Year after the Apostles 288.

This they say of receiving *every day*: But no Person then would have spoken with such indifferency of the custom of any People (if there had then been any such) that used to receive so seldom as many among the *Protestants* now a-days do. For *Gennadius loc. citat.* says, *Those that Communicate every day I do neither commend nor blame: But I would advise and perswade People to Communicate every Lord's day; provided they have a purpose of forsaking Sin.* ——— *But this I speak of those who have not any capital or mortal Crimes lying on their Consciences,* &c. Those he advises to do penance first.

§. 9. 6. He does both in this Letter, and also in the Passage last before rehearsed, and in many other Places, so speak as plainly to shew that he did not think nor pretend that Infants that are Baptized have in any proper Sense, Faith or Repentance; or Conversion of the heart, *&c.* How much soever he is here press'd with the difficulty of explaining the reason why the Godfather answers in the Child's name, *He does believe*: He does not for all that fly to the justifying of so great a Paradox, as to say that the Child does indeed in a proper sense understand, believe, or disbelieve any thing. He shews the Words are true in a Sacramental sense, but does not maintain they are so in a proper one. Nay he plainly yields they are not: He grants that Infants *cannot as yet either believe with the heart, or confess with the mouth.*

And when at other places (25) he argues that Infants after they are Baptiz'd, are no longer to be counted either among the *Infideles* or *Catechumeni*, but among the *Fideles* or *Credentes*; yet still he means and explains

(25) De peccatorum meritis l. 1. c. 25. 33. *&c.*

Year after the Apostles 288.

himself, as he does here, *That they are constituted Fideles not by that Faith which consists in the will of believers, but by the Sacrament of that Faith.*

He does indeed hold that the holy Spirit does do Offices for the Infant, and is in the Infant: You see here his Words, *The regenerating Spirit is one in those that bring the Child, and in the Child that is brought.* And in that part of the Epistle which I left out because of the length, he says, *Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiæ, & spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, solvens vinculum culpæ,* &c. 'The Water affording 'outwardly the Sacrament of the Grace, and the Spirit 'operating inwardly the benefit of the Grace, loosing the 'bond of Guilt, *&c.* do regenerate. But he supposes the Infants to be merely passive, and not to know, understand, or co-operate any thing themselves.

(26) Epist. 57.

In his Epistle to (26) *Dardanus* he says, *It is a wonderful thing to consider how God dwells in some that know him not, and in some that do know him he does not dwell. For they who* when they know God, glorifie him not as God, nor are thankful, *do not belong to his Temple: And Infants sanctified by the Sacrament of Christ, regenerated by the holy Spirit, do belong to his Temple; who, tho' they be regenerated, cannot yet by reason of their Age know God.* And afterward, *We affirm therefore that the holy Spirit dwells in baptized Infants, tho' they know it not; for after the same manner they know him not, tho' he be in 'em, as they know not their own Soul: The reason whereof which they cannot yet make use of, is in them as a spark raked up, which will kindle as they grow in years.*

(27) Chemnitii Examen. Part 2. de baptismo, can. 13.

Some Modern Divines, especially of the *Lutherans*, have gone farther, and do (27) maintain that Infants have Faith, and do believe after a certain manner; but not in the same way or manner that adult People do, whose Faith comes by Hearing, Thought, Meditation, Understanding, *&c.* for they grant that Infants have none of these: And what sort of Faith is it that they have, cannot, as they confess, be explained.

(28) Malbranch. Search. Illustrations on Ch. 7. of the 1st. part of the second Book.

But a late Philosophical Divine of the Church of *Rome*, has outdone all. He has (28) acquainted us with the Mechanism by which original Sin is formed in the Brain of an Infant before he is Born, and also how at Baptism it is rectified: It is worth knowing.

'Tis

'Tis thus; The Mother has a sinful inclination and love to the World, Pleasure, *&c.* There are tracks or traces in her Brain running all this way. The Child in her Womb has by Sympathy the same traces bred in his Brain; so he has, *before he is born, corrupt inclinations* and *is a Sinner.* The difficulty is, how this is rectified at Baptism. Year after the Apostles 288.

For this, he supposes the Child to have at the time of Baptism one strong *actual motion of love to God*; and says, *One single instant is sufficient for the exercise of that Act of love.* And, *Concupiscence is as it were mortified that moment.* And the strangest thing that he says, is, *It should not be thought strange, that I suppose it possible for Children to love God with a love of choice at the time of their Baptism. For since,* &c.

I think this Learned Author does somewhere (29) observe in his Book, that *Men of Learning are most subject to error*: And, *that those who are most hot in the search of truth are the Men that lead us into infinite errors.* He gives several reasons for this, why such Men do sometimes fall into greater mistakes than vulgar People. One more may perhaps be added to them; Vulgar People having no assistance from Learning or Philosophy, have nothing but *Common Sense* to trust to, so they generally keep close to that: They seldom allow themselves to maintain any Opinion that is very remote from it. It was not these Men that adventur'd first to teach the World, that that is in a proper sense the Body of a Man, which we see, when we have it in our hands, to be a piece of Bread. On the contrary, they can hardly believe it, tho' the Learned have taught 'em so. Neither was it for one of them to have found with all their search this truth, that an Infant at the time of Baptism loves God with a love of choice. They will hardly believe it of any Infant at any time: Much less when they see the Child fast asleep at the time of Baptism, or (as St. *Austin* observes (30) they often are) in a fit of crying and fretfulness all the while; which, as he remarks, would be very sinful, if they had any understanding.

(29) L. 2. Part 2. Ch. 4.

(30) Epist. 57.

The foresaid Author says indeed, *We ought not positively to affirm this, that Children are justified by formal acts of their will.* And he had reason, for the Council of *Trent* suppose the contrary, when they say, (31) *If any one shall say that baptized Infants, because they have*

(31) Sess. 7. Can. de Baptismo 13.

Year after the Apostles 288.

*not the act of believing, are not to be accounted* Fidelles, &c. *let him be anathema.* I suppose that Church have at last learn'd not to hang any more Mill-stones on the neck of their Religion.

He says also, *They that have treated of the effect of Baptism in the Ages past, have omitted the explaining the regeneration of Infants by the actual motions of their heart; not that they were induced by strong reasons to judge it impossible, for their works do not shew they have ever so much as examin'd it.* But St. *Austin* thought the evidence of sense to be a strong reason, when he says in the foresaid Epistle (32) to *Dardanus*; *If we should go about to prove by Discourse, that Infants, which as yet have no knowledge of humane things, have knowledge of divine things; I am afraid we should seem to offer an affront to our senses; when, let us say what we will, the evidence of the truth over-powers all the force of our talk.* He was not so hardy as either in this or the other Sacrament, or in any other point to tack any thing to our Faith that is contrary to our Sense. And he goes on there to observe that Infants, even then when they begin to talk, have so little sense or understanding, that if they should always keep to that pitch, they would be Ideots.

(32) Epist. 57.

Most of the pædobaptists go no farther than St. *Austin* does; they hold that God, *by his Spirit*, does at the time of Baptism, seal and apply to the Infant that is there dedicated to him, the promises of the Covenant of which he is capable, *viz.* Adoption, Pardon of Sin, Translation from the state of Nature to that of Grace, *&c.* On which account the Infant is said to be *regenerated of* [or, by] *the Spirit.* Not that God does by any miracle at that time illuminate or convert the mind of the Child. And for original Sin, or the corruption of Nature, they hold that God, by his Covenant, does abolish the Guilt of it, receives the Child to his mercy in Christ, and consigns to him by promise such Grace as shall afterward, by the use of means, if he live, be sufficient to keep it under, but not wholly to extirpate it in this life. It is left as the subject of trial and of a continual Christian warfare. And this is the Opinion of St. *Austin* (33) and of the Ancients in general.

(33) Contra Julianum. l. 6. c. 5, 6, 7.

The *Pelagians* on the other side set their Brains to work to find some *actual Sin* in an Infant. It was to their purpose, for since they took on 'em to deny *original* Sin, and were prest with that Argument most of all; that

that the reason why Infants are Baptiz'd, is for forgiveness of Sin: They, for an evasion, would sometimes say, that their peevishness and fretful crying as soon as they are born, is a (24) Sin: And they may be Baptized for the forgiveness of that or such like Sins. St. *Austin* explodes that rather more than the other: As being a thing that no body would ever say but to serve an Hypothesis: That *if they would calmly think of it, they would change their Opinion; and if they will not,* says he, *we shall not have so ill an Opinion of humane sense, as to fear that any body will be perswaded by 'em.* He takes nothing to be plainer than this, that a Child before the use of reason can have neither actual Sin nor actual Faith.

Year after the Apostles 288.

(34) August de peccatorum meritis. L. 1.

---

## Sect. 6. Out of St. *Austin*'s Books *de Genesi ad literam.*

### *De Genesi ad literam lib.* 10.

ST. *Austin* began and made a good Progress in these Books on *Genesis* long before *Pelagius* began to stir; but other work intervening he did not finish and publish 'em till some time after. I do not observe any thing in 'em that seems to have any respect to the dispute with him. In this tenth Book he handles the point of the origin of the humane Soul; whether every Person's Soul be by immediate Creation; or whether, as the Body of a Man is deriv'd from the Body of his Parents, so his Soul also be derived from their Soul. He recites the Arguments on both sides.

He observes (35) that the derivation of original Sin from our first Parents upon all their Posterity is made by many an Argument for the Propagation of Souls as well as Bodies. They instanc'd in Infants, concerning whom they argued thus, If we say they be derived from *Adam*, in respect of their Bodies only, and not in respect of their Souls, we must have a care that we do not, either make God to be the Author of Sin, (if he put the Soul into a Body in which it must needs Sin) or else suffer it to be believ'd that there may be some Soul,

(35) Cap. 11.

Year after the Apostles 288.

beside our Saviour Christ's, which has no need of the Christian Grace to free it from Sin. Which last is, say they, *so contrary to the belief of the Church; that Parents run with their Infants and little Ones, to procure the Grace of holy Baptism. In whom if that bond of sin be loosed, which is of the Body only, and not that which is of the Soul too, it may well be askt what hurt it would do 'em, if at that age they should die without Baptism; for if this Sacrament be for the good of their Body, and not of their Soul too, they might be Baptized after they were dead. But when as we see that the Church* universally *observes this, to run with 'em while they are alive, and to help 'em while they are alive, lest when they are dead there be nothing to be done that can do 'em any good; we see not what else can be made of it, but that every Infant is of* Adam *both as to his Body and as to his Soul.*

(36) Cap. 13.

And afterward, (36) this Argument is carried on thus, *What has the Soul of an Infant deserv'd, that it should be ruin'd in case it go out of the Body without the Sacrament of Christian Baptism, if it has neither committed any Sin of its own, nor be from that Soul which first sinned in* Adam *?*

(37) Cap. 14.

The answer to that is (37) attempted to this purpose.

God puts the Soul into an ill dispos'd Body, that by ruling and keeping under the Concupiscence thereof by the help of God's Grace, it may procure the advantage of being together with the Body chang'd into a better state at the Resurrection than ever it could have had otherwise, *viz.* of living for ever with Christ. And to comply with the steps which the Body makes by its gradual growth, the Soul is at first possessed with a *torpor*, or incapacity of acting rationally; which does not do it much hurt, because it wears off by degrees as the Body grows to perfection, and the Soul recovers from it, and arrives by God's help at a good degree of spiritual life. *Now before the time that it can live according to the Spirit it has need of the Sacrament of the Mediator,* &c. *For the punishment of original Sin is taken away even in Infancy by his Sacrament; and without his help even a grown Man will not keep under the Concupiscence of the Flesh,* &c. ——— *And the Infant must be Baptized while he is alive: Otherwise it will prove a prejudice to his Soul that it was linked with sinful Flesh; for the Soul of an Infant having participated with that, cannot be addicted to the things of the Spirit: For that Affection does weigh it down even after it is parted from the*

*the Body, unless while it is in the Body it be expiated by the one Sacrifice of the true Priest.* Year after the Apostles 288.

Reply. (38) *But how,* says one, *if the Parents take no care to have this done either thro' infidelity or negligence?* (38) Cap. 15.

Answer. *That may be said as well of grown Persons, for they may die suddenly, or they may fall sick in a place where no body will help 'em to Baptism.*

Reply. *But they have Sins of their own that need forgiveness; and if they be not forgiven, a Man cannot truly say they are punish'd undeservedly for the things they have by their own will committed in their life time. But why shall that Soul be depriv'd of eternal Life (in case no body help the Infant to Baptism) to which the Contagion it has received from sinful Flesh cannot be imputed, if it be not propagated from the first sinful Soul? For it was plac'd in the Body, not by any Sin, but by Nature that order'd it so, and by God that placed it there. And if we say that the want of Baptism will do it no hurt, then what good does it do to one that is helped to it, if there be no hurt to one that is not helped?*

*Here,* says St. *Austin, I confess that I never heard or read what they can answer for their side, who endeavour to maintain by Scripture (as being for their Opinion, or as not being against it) that new Souls, and not such as are derived from the Parents, are put into Bodies.*

Yet he attempts in the following Chapters another answer or two for those that held that Opinion of the new Creation of Souls (for himself, it is plain that he inclin'd most to the Opinion of the Propagation of 'em; only he was so modest as not to determine any thing) but they are long, and, as he shews, insufficient.

'One is, that God does not, in his Providence, suffer any Infant to die unbaptiz'd, but such as he foresaw would 'have been Wicked and Impenitent, if they had liv'd. He 'shews how absurd it is to think that God Condemns Persons for Sins, which they never did, or thought of; only he foresees they would have done 'em if they had 'lived.

§. 2. At last he comes to this end of his discourse on that Subject. Having recited many Arguments and Answers on each side, he says, (39) *Having treated of this as largely as I could for the time, I should judge the force of the Reasons, and of the Authorities to be equal, or almost equal on both sides, were it not that the Opinion of those that think the Souls to be deriv'd from the Parents has the ad-* (39) Cap. 23.

Year after the Apostles 288.

*vantage on the account of the Baptism of Infants: On which point what answer can be given them, I do not at present conceive. If God shall hereafter teach me any thing, and shall grant me an opportunity to write it, I shall not grudge it to those that are studious of such things. But I now declare beforehand that the proof concerning Infants must not be disregarded, so as that if the truth be on the other side, that should be past over without answering. Aut enim de hâc re nihil quærendum est, ut sufficiat fidei nostræ scire nos quo piè vivendo venturi sumus, etsi nesciamus unde venerimus: Aut si non impudenter æstuat anima rationalis etiam hoc nosse de seipsa, absit pervicacia contendendi, assit diligentia requirendi, humilitas petendi, perseverantia pulsandi: Ut si nobis hoc expedire novit qui meliùs quam nos quid nobis expediat utique novit, det etiam hoc qui novit dare bona data filiis suis: Consuetudo tamen matris ecclesiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est, neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omninò credenda nisi Apostolica esse traditio.* 'For either nothing at all is to be enquir'd of this Matter [the origin of the Soul] and it must suffice our Faith that we know whither we shall go, if we live well, without knowing whence we are sprung; or if it be no immodest Ambition for a reasonable Soul to desire to know this also concerning her self; putting away all obstinacy of contending, we must use diligence in inquiring, humility in asking, perseverance in knocking, that if he who knows better than we what is fit for us do judge this expedient, he would grant this also, as he grants good gifts to his Children. But the custom of our Mother the Church in Baptizing Infants must not be disregarded, nor be accounted needless, nor believed to be other than a tradition [or order] of the Apostles.

(40) Vindication of Bp. *Laud*'s Conference. Part 1. CH. IV. §. 10.

The late Bishop of *Worcester* has restor'd (40) the true reading of this place out of three ancient Manuscripts at *Oxford*: For in those last Words, *Apostolica esse traditio* the word *esse* was in the Printed Editions *esset*; which addition of one Letter had wonderfully perverted the sense, for as it stood, so it was to be Translated, *is not to be disregarded, nor to be accounted needless, nor to be believ'd at all, if it were not a tradition of the Apostles.* Which makes St. *Austin* go forward, and backward, and forward again in the same breath. But this Amendment makes it a coherent Sentence, agreeable to the scope of the place, and conformable to what St. *Austin* says in several other places

For

For example, 'tis the same Phrase with that which I recited, *Sect.* 4. §. 3. of this Chapter, *Non nisi autoritate Apostolicâ traditum rectissimè creditur*, 'is most reasonably 'believed to be no other than a thing deliver'd [or order'd] by the Authority of the Apostles. So that tho' it was not fitting to alter the reading without the Authority of some Manuscripts, yet as soon as the alteration is propos'd, it presently appears to be the true reading.

Year after the Apostles 288.

The Papists made great use of this place as it stood so Printed, to shew that some points of Faith (for they make this difference about the time of Baptism to concern a point of Faith) can be proved only by Tradition, and not by Scripture; and consequently that the Scripture is no compleat rule of Faith. *Archbishop Laud* managing the defence of the Protestant Doctrine to the contrary, says, (41) *'tis true,* Bellarmine *presses a main place out of St.* Austin, *and he urges it hard*; meaning this Place. But it might have been observed, even before the true reading was discovered, that the Words so put together are nonsense. For if St. *Austin* had said, *The* Doctrine *of Infant Baptism were not to be believed if it were not a tradition of the Apostles*, it had been Sense indeed, and something to their purpose, tho' not true. But to say, *The* Custom *of the Church in baptizing Infants were not to be believed unless it were a Tradition of the Apostles*, is not sense; because the *custom* was seen and not believed. Which is another proof that the Print was Erroneous, and that the foresaid Amendment is the true reading.

(41) Conference. §. 15. N. 5.

The Antipædobaptists on the contrary served themselves of this place to prove, as by St. *Austin*'s Confession, that the practice of Infant Baptism depended only on Tradition: From whence they concluded that it was not to be received at all. But whosoever reads these two passages of St. *Austin* that I have been comparing, will see, that he does not by the Words *Traditum* and *Traditio*, mean a Doctrine that had been taught by word of mouth only, and had no Foundation in the written Word. He plainly expresses the contrary in the former place: For he speaks to this purpose, If any one, beside the practice of the universal Church do require Divine Authority in this Matter: First, that practice having not been order'd by any Council, but having been ever in use in the Church, it is most reasona-

Year after the Apostles 288.

ble to believe that it must have been order'd by the Apostles themselves. And, Secondly, it may be prov'd from Scripture also, by the Analogy that Baptism bears to Circumcision, *&c.*

And whereas the *Latin* Phrase runs, *Non nisi autoritate Apostolicâ traditum*; that does not signifie that it was establish'd *no other way* than by a verbal Order, but that it came not in by any lesser or later Authority than that of the Apostles; not by any general Council, *&c.*

'Tis true, his arguing in that place does suppose, that tho' it could not have been prov'd from Scripture, yet if it could be prov'd to have been ordered by the Apostles by word in their life time, that ought to have satisfied any one. And so no doubt it ought, provided the proof were clear. But this does not help the Argument of the Papists, who would have the consent of the Church *at present* to be a sufficient proof of a Doctrine. For how hard or how easie soever it was at that time for the Church to know certainly the practice of the Apostles, by a Tradition which needed to be traced back but for 300 years; it is utterly impossible now to trace back a Tradition for 1600 years, unless it be recorded in Scripture, or in those Ancient Writings nigh the time of the Apostles; which, I am sure, the Pope's Supremacy and Worship of Images, *&c.* are not, whatever this, that I am Writing of, be.

Sect.

Year after the Apostles 288.

## Sect. 7. Out of St. *Austin*'s Letter to St. *Hierom.*

### *Augustini Epist.* 28.

§. 1. This Letter was written after the *Pelagian* Opinions began to be talk'd of. He mentions 'em there, *For you are*, says he, *none of those who now begin to prate new things, and say, there is no guilt deriv'd from* Adam, *which is by Baptism forgiven in an Infant.* Therefore the Quotations out of it ought not to be placed in this Chapter, were it not that here they may be dispatch'd more briefly; as being exactly to the same purpose as those I last Quoted.

St. *Austin* having, as we see, in his Books on *Genesis* so treated of the origin of the Soul, as to leave it in suspense how it is that we came by our Souls; and being still thoughtful of that Matter, and coming to know that St. *Hierom* had wrote something on this Subject in his Epistle to *Marcellinus*, and in a piece of his against *Rufinus*'s *Apology*; wherein he had spoke in favour of that opinion which makes new Souls to be created every day by God for every new Infant, calling that *the opinion of the Church*; and of the other opinion which supposes the Soul to be propagated from the Parent, had said, *That it was the opinion of* Tertullian *and* Apollinaris *and of most of the* Western *Christians, that as the Body is generated of the Body, so the Soul is of the Soul, and Subsists in a way much like to that of brute Creatures*: He had a mind to see how St. *Hierom* could free that opinion (which he seemed to embrace) of the new Creation of Souls, from the Objection that lay against it from the Propagation of original Sin from Father to Son. And therefore he writes to him, tho' he liv'd above a thousand mile off, to desire him to explain that difficulty.

And for fear of provoking him (for he was a hasty Man, and St. *Austin* had felt the sharpness of his style in an angry fit before) he writes in a most humble strain, and with great deference to his Learning and Judgment, and so as few Bishops now a-days will vouchsafe to

Write

Year after the Apostles 288.

Write to any Presbyter, intreating him to instruct and satisfy him in such things as he was ignorant of, that he might be able to instruct others.

He first sets down some things which he knew of himself, that St. *Hierom* might have the less trouble in satisfying him of the other in which he was to seek. The things that he took for certain concerning the nature of Man's Soul, were,

1. That the Soul is immortal, and does not die when it goes out of the Body.

2. That it is not a part of God. Some Philosophers had taught that. But it was rejected by all Christians, except some *Priscillianists*, and I know not who.

3. That the Soul is immaterial, he says, is a thing not easily to be prov'd to some People; but for his part he is satisfied that it is. This, I suppose, he says, that he may not seem to come too near *Tertullian*, whom St. *Hierom* had mention'd, and who had held that not the Soul only, but God also has a Body.

4. That the Soul is fallen into Sin, not by any fault of God, not by any necessity either from God, or from its own Primitive Nature, but by its own Will; and that it cannot recover it self but by the Grace of *Jesus Christ*. That there is in all Mankind no Soul but wants his Redemption.

5. *That every Soul that departs the Body, at what Age soever, without the Grace of the Mediator, and the Sacrament thereof, will be in Punishment, and will at the last Judgment receive its Body to Punishment: But if after the humane Generation which is from* Adam *it be regenerated in Christ and belong to his Communion; it will have after the death of the Body, rest, and also will receive its Body again to Glory.*

*These are,* says he, *things that I stedfastly believe concerning the Soul. Now I entreat you, hear the things that I want to know; and do not despise me, lest he despise you, who for our sakes vouchsafed to be despised.*

*Quæro ubi contraxerit anima reatum quo trahitur in condemnationem, etiam infantis morte præventi, si ei per sacramentum quo etiam parvuli baptizantur, Christi gratia non subvenerit.* 'I ask where the Soul contracted that 'Guilt, by which it is brought to Condemnation (even 'the Soul of an Infant surprized with Death) if the 'Grace of Christ do not relieve it by the Sacrament, 'whereby Infants are baptiz'd.

In the process of the Letter he takes for granted, that St. *Hierom*'s Opinion is, that a Soul is new Created for every Infant, and says, *I am very willing to be of that opinion too, but I am not as yet of it.* —— *Therefore I entreat you, teach me what I shall teach and hold, and tell me; if particular Souls be made for every particular Infant born, when it is that they do Sin in the Infant so as to need forgiveness,* &c. —— *Since we must neither say of God, that he either forces the Souls to become sinful, or punishes them being innocent; nor can deny that those Souls even of Infants which depart the Body without Christ's Sacrament do go to any other than Condemnation: I beseech you how can that opinion be defended which holds that the Souls do not come all of 'em from that one Soul of the first Man; but that as he had one made for him, so there is a particular one made for each Infant?* Year after the Apostles 288.

He then recites some other Objections that some People made against this opinion: As, that God rested the seventh day from making any new thing. And, that God, when he saw an Infant begotten in Whoredom, would never create a Soul for that, *&c.* And he says, That he himself could easily answer all those Objections; and adds.

*But when I come to the Pains suffer'd by Infants, I am, I assure you, brought to great streights, and cannot find any thing at all to answer: I mean, not only those Pains which after this Life do attend that Condemnation to which they must go if they die without the Sacrament of the Christian Grace, but those which in this Life we see with our Eyes, and it grieves us to see; which if I should go to count, I should sooner want time than instances. They languish with Sickness, they are tortur'd with Pains, they are afflicted with Hunger and Thirst, maim'd in their Limbs, depriv'd of their Senses, tormented with unclean Spirits.* He afterwards asks, *Whether we are to think that as the herd of Swine was given to the Devils to do their Pleasure with 'em, so God hath left Infants to their Will without a just cause?*

Afterward in trying every side of this Argument, to see if there be any escaping the force of it, he speaks of the necessity there was to believe that Infants cannot be saved without Christ, and that they have not the benefits of Christ consigned to 'em but by Baptism: And having mention'd that saying of the Apostle, *As in* Adam, *all die, so in Christ shall all be quickned,* and some other Texts, he says,

*And*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*And therefore whosoever shall tell us that any one can be quickned in the Resurrection of the dead except by Christ, is to be abhorred as the bane of our common Faith. And whosoever shall say that Infants shall be quickned in Christ, which die without partaking of his Sacrament, does both contradict the Apostle's Preaching, and also* totam condemnat Ecclesiam, *condemns the whole Church, in which Men do hasten and run with their Infants to be baptized, doubtless for that reason because they believe that otherwise they cannot be quickned in Christ. And he that is not quickned in Christ, must remain in that Condemnation of which the Apostle speaks,* By one Man's offence Judgment came on all to Condemnation. *To which Condemnation that Infants are born liable,* Et omnis credit Ecclesia, *both all the Church believes, and you, in your Books against* Jovinian, *and in your* Exposition on the Prophet Jonah, *have most Orthodoxly proved, as I said before, and I suppose in other places of your Works, which I have not read, or do not at present remember.*

*Now I would know what is the cause of this Condemnation. For if new Souls be made for every Infant, I can't see any Sin of the Souls at that Age, and I don't believe that God will condemn any which he sees to have no Sin.*

After another Paragraph in which he quotes a passage out of the Letter of St. *Cyprian*, which I produced above, (42) he says, *There must be a reason given why Souls that are new created in all that are born are condemned; for that they are condemned if they so die both the holy Scripture, and the holy Church is witness. Therefore this opinion of the Creation of new Souls, if it do not oppose this most establish'd Faith, shall be mine; and if it do, don't let it be yours.*

(42) CH. VI. §. 1.

Then he shews the absurdity of those who answer all this by saying that the Soul sinned in some former state before it came into the Body.

He concludes with protesting that he could wish that that opinion of St. *Hierom* might be shewn to be true: He lik'd it so well in other respects, were it not for this Objection. He mentions his Prayers to God that the doubt in which he was of this Matter, might, if it were God's Will, be clear'd to him by St. *Hierom*'s means: But owns he must have patience if God refuse him this request. And of the several ways of clearing it, says,

*Ante-*

*Antequam sciam quænam earum potiùs eligenda sit, hoc me non temerè sentire profiteor, eam quæ vera est non adversari robustissimæ ac fundatissimæ fidei, quâ Christi Ecclesia nec parvulos homines recentissimè natos à damnatione credit, nisi per gratiam nominis Christi quam in suis sacramentis commendavit, posse liberari.* Year after the Apostles 288.

'Before I know which of 'em is to be chosen, this I 'know, that that of 'em which is the true, does not op-'pose that most firm and establish'd Faith, by which the 'Church of Christ believes that even the new Born little 'Ones of Mankind cannot be freed from Condemnation, 'but by the Grace of the name of Christ, which he has 'commended to us in his Sacraments.

St. *Hierom* in his answer (43) to this Letter did not think fit to enter upon a discussion of this question of the origin of the Soul; but answer'd in short, that it was *better for each to abound in his own Sense*, than by their disputes of this Matter, to give advantage to their common Enemies the *Pelagians*, who said there was no original Sin at all, *We*, says he, *do indeed argue this Matter for instructions sake; but our Adversaries, and especially the Hereticks, when they see us of different opinions, will slander us as if we did it out of Envy.* ——— *Let us rather do our endeavour that that most pernicious Heresie may be exstinguish'd, which always pretends Repentance, that it may have opportunity of teaching* in the Church, *lest if it should declare it self openly, it should be expell'd from thence, and so die.* (43) Epist. 94.

And St. *Austin*, tho' he reckon'd that in the other way of explaining the origin of the Soul, which was embraced in the *Western* Church, *viz.* That it as well as the Body, is Begotten by the Parents, it was much more easie to account for the guilt of original Sin, yet never was positive. Neither did he publish this Letter, as he (44) says himself, so long as St. *Hierom* liv'd: *Because if he had written any answer, they might be better publish'd together. But when he was dead, I publish'd it*, says he, *that he that reads it may take advice, either not to make any inquiry at all how the Soul is given to those that are born; or else in so very obscure a Matter to admit of such a solution of the question as is not contrary to those plain Points which the Catholick Faith owns concerning Infants, that they will doubtless be Condemn'd if they be not Regenerated in Christ.* (44) Retract. l. 2. c. 45.

The

Year after the Apostles 288.

The opinion of St. *Hierom*, that the Soul is by immediate Creation, has since prevailed to be almost the universal opinion in the *West* as well as the *East*.

§. 2. But the Mechanick Philosophy that is lately come in vogue, has set some Men upon an attempt to frame an Hypothesis about the Nature of the Soul, which I cannot say is of St. *Austin*'s side, because it carries the matter a great deal farther than he would have it. It makes the Soul not to be any thing really distinct from the Body: But only such a disposition of the parts of the Body, as makes it fit to live, move, remember, think, *&c.* all which they think may be done by a System of Matter, provided there be skill enough in the Contriver; and they refer us to the infinite Art of God. So the old definition of *Aristotle* is come in request again, that it is nothing but *Actus Corporis organici.*

One may explain their meaning best by a thing that is more obviously apprehended. The disposition of the Wheels in a Clock, such as will make it go, may, for explication sake, be called the Soul of the Clock. And when the Wheels are so rusty or broken that it will no longer go, the Soul of it is gone; and a skilful Artificer that can mend it, and make it go better than before, gives it a Resurrection.

But there is in this Sense no notion of a Soul existing in a separate Condition; and accordingly these Men believe no such thing.

The Antipædobaptists have been much inclin'd to an opinion of Man's Soul, that it either dies with the Body, and has no existence, or falls asleep, as some term it, and has no Sense, till the resurrection. It is an opinion that took footing early among them in *Germany.* For *Calvin*, in his Work called *Psychopannychia*, written 1534. says, (45) *Some People in* Arabia *were the first Authors of this opinion, who said the Soul died with the Body, and rose again at the day of Judgment: And afterward* John *Bishop of* Rome *held it; whom the School* [or Academy] *of* Paris *forced to recant. And after it had been laid to sleep for some Ages, it was lately revived by some of the* Anabaptist *sort.* And in his *Instructio adversus Anabaptistas* (46) written 1544. he says, *They all commonly hold that Souls separate from the Body do sleep without any sense or understanding till the day of Judgment: Or, that the Soul of a Man*

(45) In præfatione.

(46) Art. 7.

*a Man is his Life, which ceases when he dies, till he be rais'd again.* Year after the Apostles 288.

Some of the Antipædobaptists do still hold the same opinion; I know not whether they do all. P. S. I am since satisfied that they do not all.

'Tis a wonder how they, of all People, came to fall into this opinion. For since they do, most of 'em, deny original Sin, the other opinion, which the generality of Christians do now embrace, (*viz.* That the Soul of each Infant is a spiritual Substance, anew created by God, capable of existing without a Body, but put by him into the Body) is much fitter for their purpose. For, as St. *Austin* here shews, the opinion of original Sin deriv'd to us all in our Infancy from *Adam* our first Parent, is much more easie to conceive on a supposal that we have nothing in us but what is propagated from the Seed of *Adam*, than it is upon a supposal that God creates a Soul out of nothing, which can subsist of it self, and puts it into the Body for a time. For how comes that Soul to have a guilt, deriv'd to it from the sin of *Adam*, which has no succession at all from *Adam*, but is now lately created by God? It is indeed put into a Body deriv'd from *Adam*. But Sin is of the Soul, rather than of the Body. And besides, it was not its own fault or choice that it was put into a sinful Body.

So that the Pædobaptists and Antipædobaptists holding these opinions thus cross wise, do make a Controversie, which in this particular looks something like a dispute (47) mention'd by St. *Chrysostom*, that was manag'd in his time between a *Christian* and a *Greek*, but so unskilfully, that he says, *The* Greek *said what the* Christian *should have said, and the* Christian *said what the* Greek *should have said.*

(47) In 1. ad Corinth. Hom. 3.

It is however a requisite property of Sincerity, to declare and profess in any point what we think truest, tho' the other side do seem to suit better with our other Tenets. The contrary, is to serve not the Truth, but our Hypothesis.

I am afraid we must all sit down in our disquisition concerning the origin of our Souls, content with the Comfort, with which St. *Austin* here supports himself, that we know, if we live well, whither we shall go after this State, without knowing how we came into it. For the Explication that the Schools have since added to this Matter, with their *creando infunditur & infundendo*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*creatur* has put some new Words into our Mouths, but no new Sense into our Heads.

I shall here so far trespass upon the proposed method of quoting the Passages wherein the *Pelagians* were concern'd by themselves, as to rehearse here what St. *Austin* said a great while after on this Subject. The *Pelagians* in a Letter which 18 Bishops of their Party wrote and publish'd by common consent, pick'd out several things that seemed absurd in the Doctrine of the Catholicks; and among the rest, this, that they prov'd the propagation of Sin by the propagation of Souls, or held 'em as points that would stand or fall together. St. *Austin*, in his answer to that part of their Letter (48) says,

(48) L. 3. contra duas Epist. Pelagian. c. 10.

*They add here, to cloud or confound the Matter, an unnecessary question of the origin of Souls: To the end that by disturbing things that are plain by the obscurity of other matters, they may seek an opportunity of lying hid. For they say that we maintain the propagation of Sin together with the propagation of Souls; which, where or when they have heard in the Speeches, or read in the Books of those that defend the Catholick Faith, I know not. For tho' I do meet with some things written by Catholicks on this Subject, yet that was before the defence of the truth was undertaken against these Men, and not in answer to any thing of theirs.*

*But this I say, That original Sin is so plain by the Scriptures, and that it is forgiven to Infants in the laver of Regeneration, is so confirm'd by the Antiquity and Authority of the Catholick Faith, so notorious by the practice of the Church; that whatsoever is disputed, inquir'd or affirm'd of the origin of the Soul, if it be contrary to this, cannot be true.*

This was his constant Tenet, that tho' he inclin'd to one side of the question, concerning the origin of the Soul, yet he would not have the Doctrine of original Sin to depend upon that.

§. 3. There is one thing more observable from these two last passages of St. *Austin, viz.* That there was no such thing then us'd, as private Baptism of Children in Houses, except in cases of the greatest extremity; and that even Sick Children were carried to the Church, if it were possible. For it is of such that he says, *Men do hasten and run with 'em to be Baptiz'd while they are alive, lest when they are dead there be nothing to be done*, &c. It was to the Church that they ran, where there were large

Fonts

Fonts or Baptisteries, in which Infants or grown Persons might be put into the Water: And it has since been decreed in a general Council in *Trullo, Can.* 59. That Baptisms shall not be in Private Chapels, but in the Publick Church.

Year after the Apostles 288; 591.

This was so generally observed from the time that Churches were built, till of late days, that we read of many Kings Sons, and Kings themselves, converted to the Christian Faith, that received their Baptism in the Church. Whereas now a days Persons of much lower Rank take the state upon 'em to expect it to be brought home to their Children, tho' they are well. And there they put a great Contempt upon it, by making it a formal Ceremony, subservient to their Belly Chear, and a Drinking Feast; little regard being given to the holy Sacrament, or the Prayers used thereat.

In cases of urgent extremity the Ancients did indeed Baptize any where; in the House, in the Bed, *&c.* rather than the Party should die without it. I mean to give by and by (49) several proofs of that. But they never did so but in such cases.

(49) Part 2. CH. IX. §. 2.

The Church of *England* allows of Baptism by a Minister in Private Houses in cases of necessity; but gives positive order, that it be not used except in case of danger of the Child's death; and that such a Child, if it lived, be brought to the Church, and his Baptism declared there. And some Bishops and Curates of the said Church do shew a zeal to have this Order, which has of late been much neglected, put again in due Execution. But others of 'em seem more indifferent about it. And in most places it is found a difficult thing to overcome that lazy and irreverent Custom, which took such deep footing among the People in the late disorderly times.

There never was a more Capricious change made by any sort of People in any matter of Religion than the *English Presbyterians* have made in this Point. No longer ago than Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, they made it one of their Objections against the *English Common Prayer Book*, that it gave any allowance for this *Private Baptism* at all. They Pleaded; *That it is not lawful either to Preach the Word, nor to Minister the Sacraments in Private corners: That they ought not to be but where the Church is; and that the Church ought not to assemble (if it be not letted by Persecution) but in open Places: That* John *Baptized openly: That* Austin, *although he were of that Mind, that Children could*

Year after the Apostles 288.

*could not be saved without Baptism, yet in the time of necessity (as it is called) he does not allow either of Baptism in Private Houses, or by Women; but when there was danger, the Women hasted to carry the Children unto the Church.*

These, and more such like Pleas, *Cartwright* us'd in his Disputation with *Archbishop Whitgift.* (50) *And so you see,* says he, *those whom you charge slanderously with Conventicles, are fain to glaze up the Windows that you open to Secret and Private Conventicles.* And having mentioned *the orders that God has set, that it should be done in the Congregation, and by the Minister of the Gospel.* He adds this Rigid and Presbyterian Expression, *And I will farther say, That altho' that the Infants which die without Baptizing should be assuredly damn'd (which is most false) yet ought not the Orders which God has set in his Church be broken after this sort. For as the Salvation of Men ought to be dear unto us; so the glory of God, which consisteth in that his Orders be kept, ought to be much more dear.*

(50) See *Whitgift*'s Defence of Answer to Admonition. Tr. 9. ch. 3, 4, 5. It. Tr. 2. ch. 1. div. 8.

*Whitgift*, on the other side, shews that the Book did not say any thing of Baptism by Women or by Laymen; he pleads for no more than this, *That upon extreme necessity of Sickness, peril of Death, and such like, the Curate may be sent for, or some other Minister that may sooner be come by,* to do it in the House. But he is not allowed that.

And yet how strangely have these Men since ran into the other extreme? When they came to have the ordering of Matters in the Church, they (tho' contrary to the rules of their own *Directory*) gratified the humour of the People in this Matter far more than ever the Church of *England* had done. If their Religion had been Parliamentary, as the Papists slander all our Religion to be, they could not have taken a more violent swing from one side to the other.

At present they and their People make this House-Baptism the most ordinary way of administring that Sacrament, be the Child sick or well; and in *London*, and other Places where any of them are, a Clergyman of the Church of *England*, cannot if he would, bring his People to the Observation of the foresaid order of the Church; because if any humoursome Man or Woman of his Parish have a mind to have their Child, tho' in never so good health, Baptized in the House, and he deny 'em, the next thing is, they, in a pet send for one of these Men, who are always ready to do it.

There

There are no Orders of the Church that do come in proceſs of time to be more groſly and univerſally abus'd, than thoſe that begin firſt to be diſpenc'd with for the State and Character of the Perſons concern'd in 'em. This was firſt granted as a Privilege of Kings, or Kings Sons, as appears by the Decretals of *Clement* the Fifth, and by the Council of *Cologne*, where it is ordain'd that none but they ſhould be Baptiz'd at home. Afterward it came, I ſuppoſe, to be allow'd to Noble Men, and ſo to other Rich Men. And as every Body effects the Name and State of Gentility, they think themſelves hardly dealt with, if they be accounted in this Matter inferior to ſuch, or ſuch of their Neighbours.

Year after the Apoſtles 288.

This, and many other inſtances of like nature that might be given, ſhould teach the Clergy to take care how they make any beginning of breaking that rule of Scripture given by St. *James* (51) againſt any reſpect of Perſons to be ſhewn in Church matters; for if you once begin, there is no ſtop to be made afterward: Therefore the Synod of *Aix* (52) determin'd, *That no Curate or other Prieſt ſhould, under pain of Excommunication, go to any Houſe, not even of a Nobleman, to adminiſter Baptiſm, except in caſe of neceſſity; and that no caſe ſhould be taken to be of neceſſity, but when the Child's Life is in danger.*

(51) Ch. 2. V. 1, 2, 3.

(52) Bochell. Decret. Eccl. Gall. de Baptiſmo, cap. 77. 1485.

---

## CHAP. XVI.

### *Quotations out of ſome Councils of* Carthage, *before the* Pelagian *Controverſie.*

§. 1. THe moſt Ancient Councils of *Carthage*, as well as of other Churches, are not recorded in the Volumes of Councils. The Cuſtom of regiſtring the Acts of Councils, and bringing them into Volumes begun later. One of the firſt of all the Councils of *Carthage*, and (except one or two) of the moſt Ancient in all Chriſtendom, ſince the times of the

Year after the Apoſtles 297.

Year after the Apostles 297.

Apostles, of which we have any remains, was that of 66 Bishops under St. *Cyprian* in the year after the Apostles 150. which resolved the question whether Infant Baptism might be administred on the first or second day after the Birth, or must be deferred till the eighth. But the account of that is given before at large in *Chap.* VI. Those that I mean to recite here, are of such as are set down in the common Volumes, and were about the latter end of the fourth Century.

(1) Hist. lit. Part. 2. pag. 132.

And of these Dr. *Cave* (1) and others have observ'd that there is great obscurity and difficulty in assigning the very year on which they were held, and some confusion by reason of the carelesness or mistakes of the Collectors, who have sometimes inserted into one Council some of the Canons that have been made in another. I shall not in these nice matters pretend to be wiser than other Men. But the first Canon that I shall quote, carries in it self a plain and undoubted indication of the year in which it was Enacted.

It is the 48th Canon of that Council of *Carthage* which is generally call'd the *Third*. About the time when this Council was held, the Schism of the *Donatists* began to break apace, and those who had been brought up in it came over in great numbers to the Communion of the Church. This Party of Men, as I shew'd (2) before, differ'd nothing from the Catholicks in any point either of Doctrine, or of Ceremonies, or of Sacraments; but only they accounted that Party in *Africa* which was called the Catholick Church, impure, by reason of some Ill Men that were among 'em, or by reason that some of the Ministers thereof deriv'd their Ordination from Bishops that had, as was said, been guilty of Apostacy in the former times of Persecution, and all that came over to them from the Catholicks they had been wont to Baptize anew, as coming out of an impure Church.

(2) CH. IX.

Now the Bishops of this Council debated among themselves how far it was expedient to admit any that return'd from this Schism to the Church, into holy Orders. And as for those who having been once Baptiz'd in the Catholick Church, did, after they came to years, revolt to the *Donatists*, and were Baptiz'd by them; they agreed that such, upon their return to the Church, might be admitted to Lay-Communion, but never to bear any Office in the Church. But the case of those that had been born among the *Donatists*,

*tists*, and had been in their Infancy Baptized by them, and after they came to years of Discretion disliked the Schism, and came over to the Church, seem'd very different. Year after the Apostles 297.

Concerning these they could not come to any Resolution at the present: And therefore they agreed that the advice of two of the most noted Neighbouring Churches should be askt in that Matter; and they made a Canon in these Words,

## *Concilii Carthag. tertii Can.* 48.

*De Donatistis, placuit ut consulamus fratres & consacerdotes nostros siricium & Simplicianum de solis infantibus qui baptizantur penes eosdem, ne [leg. an] quod suo non fecerunt judicio cùm ad ecclesiam Dei salubri proposito fuerint conversi, paretum illos error impediat, ne provehantur sacri altaris ministri.*

'In reference to the *Donatists*, it is resolved that we 'do ask the advice of our Brethren and fellow Bishops '*Siricius* and *Simplicianus*, concerning those only who 'are in Infancy Baptiz'd among them; whether in that 'which they have not done by their own Judgment, the 'error of their Parents shall hinder 'em, that when they 'by a wholesome purpose shall be converted to the 'Church of God, they may not be promoted to be Ministers of the holy Altar.

The Collection that is called *Concilium Africanum*, has this same Canon *capitulo* 14. *Siricius* was at this time Bishop of *Rome* and *Simplicianus* of *Milan*. So that, as I said, this Canon gives us from it self a clear proof of the year when it was made, *viz. Anno Dom.* 397. for 297.
*Simplicianus* was not made Bishop of *Milan*, till the beginning of this year, when he came into the room of St. *Ambrose*, who died then, and in the beginning of the next year *Siricius* Bishop of *Rome* died.

§. 2. The answer of these two Bishops seems to have been in favour of those, concerning whom their opinion was asked; for four years after the Council of *Carthage* determines the point absolutely, that such Persons may, 302.
if there be occasion be promoted to the ministry. The Canon, leaving out the digressions, is this.

Year after the Apostles 297.

*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ, Can.* 57.

*Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage* speaks in the Council, and says,

*Superiori Concilio Statutum esse mecum recognoscit unanimitas vestra ut hi qui apud Donatistas parvuli baptizati sunt nondum scire valentes erroris eorum interitum, & posteaquam ad ætatem rationis capacem pervenerunt, agnitâ veritate, &c. ------- recepti sunt. ------- Sine dubio ad officium clericatûs tales esse applicandos, & maximè in tantâ rerum necessitate nullus est qui non concedat.*

*Quanquam nonnulli ejusdem sectæ clerici cum plebibus atque honoribus suis ad nos transire desiderent, &c.----- Sed hoc majori fratrum supradictorum considerationi dimittendum censeo. ------ Tantum de his qui Infantes baptizati sunt satagimus, ut nostræ, si placet, in isdem ordinandis consentient voluntati, &c.*

'You remember that in a former Counil it was re-
'solved that they who were, in their Infanc, before they
'were able to understand the mischief of that error,
'Baptized among the *Donatists*, and wheithey came to
'age of Understanding, acknowledging he truth, *&c.*
'-----they were received by us. ------ ll will grant
'that such may undoubtedly be promotd to Church
'Offices, especially in times of so great ned.

'Some that have been *Teachers* in tat Sect would
'come over with their Congregations, if hey might have
'the same places among us, *&c.* ------ut this I leave
'to a farther consideration of our Brethro, *&c.* ------
'Only that they will consent to our dermination, that
'such as were Baptized by them in Infacy, may be ad-
'mitted to Orders.

This shews plainly that the *Donatist*as well as *Catholicks* Baptized in Infancy: Only thoseat had been Baptized by the Church Party, whethe in Infancy, or at full Age, they would not receive intheir Sect without giving them a new Baptism, becau they judged Baptism given in an impure Church w void, tho' it were given in the right Form, and to a bject never so capable; for which the Church ch/ged them with the Crime

Crime of *Anabaptism*, or Rebaptization. And they were about this time reduced, and came over to the Church. Year after the Apostles 300.

§. 3. There are added in the old Copies of the said *Third* Council of *Carthage*, *Anno Dom.* 397 some Canons of which it is said, *It is not certain whether they belong properly to the first, or second, or third Council.* One of 'em (3) is for abating to poor People the Fees that were usually paid to the Minister at the Baptizing of a Child. But it being accounted by the most Learned Criticks to be of a later date, and to have been crowded in here by *Mercator*, I shall omit the recital of it.

(3) Labbei Concil. It. Carranza summa Concil. concil. Carthag. Tertium. It Gratian. q. 1.

§. 4. The next of the Councils of *Carthage*, in which we find any mention of Infant Baptism, is that which is vulgarly called the *Fifth*, and was celebrated three years after, *viz. Anno Dom.* 400. In which there is a Canon that makes Provision for the case of such as had been carried away Captive in their Infancy, into the Country of the *Barbarians*, and when they were ransom'd, there was none of their Friends left alive that could certainly tell whether they had been Baptiz'd before their carrying away or not. Such Persons, or their surviving Friends for them, were in great perplexity and doubt, whether it were fit that they should be Baptiz'd after their ransom. For if they were Baptiz'd before their Captivity, then this would be to Baptize 'em twice; which was look'd on by all Christians, except the *Marcionites*, to be a great profanation of the Sacrament. And if they were not Baptiz'd before, then not to do it now, were to let them die without any Baptism at all. The Words of the Canon are these,

## *Concilii Carthaginiensis Quinti Canon 6.*

*Placuit de infantibus quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere; absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos: Ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari. Hinc enim legati Maurorum fratres nostri consuluerunt*, &c.

'It is resolved concerning Infants of whose having 'been Baptiz'd there are no positive Witnesses that can 'give certain Evidence, and they themselves are not ca- 'pable to give any account of that Sacrament having

'been

Year after the Apostles 300.

'been administred to 'em, by reason of their Age; that 'such be without any scruple Baptized; lest that scruple 'do cause 'em to go without the cleansing of the Sacra-'ment. For our Brethren that come from the *Mauritanians* have asked our advice on this question, who do 'ransom many such from the *Barbarians*, &c.

I set this Council at *Anno* 400. that is the year after the Apostles 300. And so do all late Writers that speak of it, set it then, or within a year or two of that time. Which I note because *Binius* and some other old Copies give it a date that is very absurd and inconsistent, worded thus, *Circa tempora Anastasii Papæ, post consulatum Cæsarii & Attici, sexto Kalendas Junii habitum, æra* 438. 'Held 'about the time of Pope *Anastasius*, after the Consul-'ship of *Cæsarius* and *Atticus*, six days before the Ka-'lends of *June*, in the year 438. But the Consulship of *Cæsarius* and *Atticus* was in the year 397. And *Anastasius* came into the See *Anno* 398. and liv'd but four years. And *Aurelius*, whose name is among the Bishops that subscribed this Council, could not live to 438.

So that *Baronius*, *Spondanus*, Dr. *Cave*, &c. place it *Anno* 398. *Justellus* and Cardinal *Perron*, *Anno* 401. *Schelstratius* this year 400. All in the time of *Anastasius*. And another thing which confirms its being on one of these years, is the Matter of the last Canon of it: And yet the different understanding of some words of that Canon, cause the difference in placing it of a year or two. The Canon is this, *Resolved, That a Petition be made to the most Renowned Emperors, that all Reliques of Idolatry, not only in Images, but in all Places, whether Groves or Trees, be altogether destroyed.*

Now all agree, that on the year 399. was the most general overthrow of the Heathen Temples, in all the Empire, but especially at *Carthage*; and in all *Africa*. St. *Austin* gives (4) the account of it, which is very remarkable.

(4) De civitate Dei. l. 18. c. 53, 54.

The Heathens had had a Tradition very rife among 'em, that the Christian Religion should last but 365 years, to be reckon'd from the beginning of it. They depended upon an Oracle for this: The Oracle had said, that *Peter* the Apostle being a skilful Magician, had, by killing and cutting in pieces a Child of a year old, and burying the Limbs of it with certain Magical Rites, raised so strong a Charm for the success of the Christian Religion, that it must now last for so many years as the Child

was

was days old: But when that time was expir'd, they should see it presently come to an end. And one may perceive by St *Austin*'s words, that the Heathens at that time expected the extirpation of *Christianity* as confidently as the Papists do now the extirpation of the *Northern Heresie*. Year after the Apostles 300.

St. *Austin* allows them the latest time they could suppose for the beginning of Christian Religion, *viz.* the *Pentecost* that was next after Christ's death. He shews that 365 years reckon'd from that *Pentecost*, do end in the Consulship of *Honorius* and *Eutychianus*, which is in our way of reckoning, the year 398. *Now*, says he, *the next year to that, being the Consulship of* Honorius *and* Manlius Theodorus, *when, according to that Oracle of Devils, or Figment of Men, there should have been no such thing as Christian Religion in the world, what was done in other Countries I had not occasion to inquire; but this I know, that in* Carthage, *the most noted and eminent City of all* Africa, Gaudentius *and* Jovius, *the Emperor* Honorius's *Lieutenants, did, on the* 19*th of* March, *pull down the temples of the false Gods, and break in pieces their Idols. From which time to this present, being almost* 30 *years, who does not see how much the Worship of Christ's name has encreased? Especially since many of those are become Christians, who were before kept back from the Faith, by that Prophecy, which, now the time is past, they perceive to have been a foolish and idle one.*

*Baronius* thinks that this order of *Honorius*, for razing the Heathen Temples, was given by him in compliance with that *Petition* made by this Council of *Carthage*; and, if so, the razing being *Anno* 399, the Council must have been the year before. But others think that the style of the Petition supposes the Temples and such publick places of Idolatry at *Carthage* to be destroyed already; and that the Bishops desire the Emperor to compleat that good work, by extirpating all the remains of Idolatry practis'd with Images plac'd in *Groves, Trees*, &c.

This latter seems the more probable by the Words of the Petition. So the Council may be suppos'd to be the year after the Emperor's first Order, *viz. Anno Christi* 400. but however, it appears to have been about this time.

§. 5. There had been, as it seems, in some Council at *Hippo* before that time, a Resolution to the same purpose, *viz.* That those who had no certain proof of their 290.

Baptism

Year after the Apostles 290.

Baptism in Infancy should be, for certainty, Baptized now. For there is in *Labbe*'s Collection, and in the *Magdeburgenses* (5) at the year 397. set down a Copy of a *Synodical* Letter dated *Cæsario* and *Attico Coss.* wherein they complain, *That these things which had been long ago Enacted in the Council of* Hippo *had not been so duly put in Execution as they ought.* They enjoin better Execution of them for the future, and to that purpose give a Breviate of 'em, being 41 in number: The 40th of which is given thus, *De his qui nullo testimonio se baptizatos noverunt, ut baptizentur.* 'For those that are not sure by a'ny Evidence that they have been Baptized: That they 'be now Baptized.

(5) Cent. 4. c. 9. de Synodis. pag. 866.

340. §. 6. It was not long after these times that *Leo* the First, Bishop of *Rome*, had occasion to consider of the same case in a Synod at *Rome*; and he has left an Epistle on that Subject: Which, tho' it be something later than the Period of time which I have propos'd to search, *Leo* being made Bishop of that See in the year of Christ 440, yet it being so particularly relating to this Matter, I shall here transcribe so much of it as is to this purpose. It is directed to *Neon*, Bishop of *Ravenna*, and is the 37th among his Epistles.

*We have been given to understand by the relation of some Brethren, that several Captives, who were carried into Captivity at that age which has no firm knowledge of any thing, do, now they are restor'd to their Liberty and their Home, desire the remedy of Baptism. But by reason of the ignorance of their Infancy, they cannot remember whether or no they have received the Sacrament of that Mystery before. And that by reason of this uncertain state of remembrance, their Souls are brought into danger; for that under pretence of Caution the Grace is denied them,* Quæ ideo non impenditur quia putatur impensa, *being therefore not given them, because it is suppos'd that they have had it already.*

*When therefore the scrupulousness of some Brethren did, not without cause, make a doubt of administring to such Persons the Sacrament of our Lord's Mystery, We did, as I said at a Synodical meeting take this sort of case into our Consideration, and set our selves to discuss the point with a careful diligence, according to the Opinion of every one: That by the Judgment of many considering the matter together, we might more certainly fix on the truth. And that which by God's guidance came into my Mind, the numerous consent of the Brethren confirmed.*

*We*

Year after the Apostles 340.

*We ought then, above all things, to beware that while we shew a sort of Caution, we do not fall into a failure of regenerating their Souls. For who would be so addicted to his Suspicions, as to define a thing to be true, which without any full proof, he by an uncertain Opinion surmises to be so? Therefore whenas neither he that desires the regeneration does remember that he was ever Baptized, nor any one else can testifie of his Consecration* [or, Sanctification] *there is no reason to think there is any Sin in doing this, when neither he that is Consecrated, nor he that Consecrates him, acts any thing against his Knowledge* [or, Conscience].

*I know indeed that it is an inexcusable fault, when, according to the fashion of the* Hereticks, *which is condemn'd by the holy Fathers, any one is compell'd to reiterate his Baptism, which is once for all given to those that are to be regenerated: The Apostolic Doctrine being against such a Practice, and teaching us that there is but one* Godhead *in the* Trinity, *one* Confession *in the* Faith, *and one* Sacrament *of* Baptism: *But there is nothing like that to be feared in this case; for that cannot be brought within compass of the Crime of reiteration, of which we are not sure that it has been done once.*

*And therefore when any such Case comes before you, first examine the Matter narrowly, and continue your search for a great while (unless the Party seems to be nigh his end) whether there be no Body at all to be found that can help out the ignorance of such a Person that knows not his own Condition. And if it appear that he that wants, the Sacrament, is kept off only by a vain surmise, let him come without fear to the obtaining of the Grace, of which he does not find any Evidence that he has had it before. And let us not be afraid to open the gate of Salvation to him, who cannot be prov'd as yet to have entred into it.*

*But if it can be prov'd that any such Person has been Baptized, tho' by the Hereticks; let the Sacrament of regeneration be by no means reiterated on him; but let that only which was wanting there be now added; that he have the imposition of Hands by the Bishop, for the obtaining the Grace of the holy Spirit.*

*These things, dear Brother, I was willing should come to the knowledge of you all; lest while you allow too much to your scruples, the Mercy of God be denied to those that desire to be saved.*

*Dated the ninth before the Kalends of* November, *in the Consulship of* Martian *the Emperor.*

The

Year after the Apostles 340.

The same question being put to him by *Rusticus*, Bishop of *Narbon*, he resolves it to the (6) same effect; and so does *Gregory* the Great, in the next Age; (7) and so does the Council in *Trullo*, *Can.* 84. *Anno* 691.

490. 591. (6) Ep. 52. Cap. 16. (7) L. 12. Ep. 31.

The *Hereticks* that *Leo* talks of, as reiterating Baptism, were either the *Marcionites* who gave to some People a second or third Baptism, tho' they own'd the first to have been true Baptism; or else the *Donatists*, who thinking no Baptism to be true, that was not given by such Holy and Pure Men as themselves, gave a new Baptism to all that came from any other Party to theirs.

The Church of *England* is very careful, as not to let any one go without Baptism, so also not to Baptize again those that have been Baptiz'd already. And therefore when any Person is brought to Baptism, concerning whom they cannot be sure whether he is already Baptized or not, they order him to be Baptiz'd with these conditional Words preceding the form of Baptism, *If thou art not already Baptiz'd*, N. *I Baptize thee in the name*, &c.

1059. (8) Vide Vossium de baptismo. Disp. 15. Art. 11.

It had been usual to do so for many hundred years (8) before. But *Luther* found great fault with this Custom; and *Vossius* dislikes it, but gives no other reason against it than that there is no example of such conditional Baptism in Scripture, nor in the Records of the first Ages. Which in a case that so seldom happens, is no wonder; for in the Church of *England*, where it is appointed in a certain case, yet that case being rare, very few have ever had occasion to practice it. But it is certain that all that do Baptize in such a case, do understand that condition, tho' they do not express it; for they do it on a supposal that the Party is not Baptized already.

311.

The next Council of *Carthage* that I know of, that had any occasion to mention Infant Baptism, was that *Anno* 411 or the beginning of 412, where *Celestius* was Challeng'd for denying original Sin, and thought to escape the Brand of Heresie by declaring, that whatever he thought of Sin in Infants, yet he own'd their Baptism. This Council is not in the Volumes, but St. *Austin* has preserv'd some of the Acts of it, by quoting them in his Writings; and I had occasion to recite out of him what is material to this purpose in a Chapter (9) before.

316. (9) CH. V. §. 8. (10) CH. XIX. §. 28. Et lib. 6. Capit. Carolo Magni.

And the next to that was that *Anno* 416. A Synodical Letter whereof I shall recite hereafter (10).

CHAP.

Year after the Apostles 284.

# CHAP. XVII.

## *Out of the Decretal Epistles of* Siricius *and* Innocentius, *Bishops of* Rome.

§. 1. THere never was a greater cheat and abuse put upon the Church, and the Learned World than that piece of Forgery of the most ancient *Decretal Epistles.* The Papists themselves are now asham'd to hear 'em mentioned, except some few, whose want of all Shame makes amends for their want of Learning.

The History of 'em in short is this, the ancient Bishops of *Rome* were frequently consulted with by the Country Bishops, and the Bishops of the neighbouring Churches in cases of Conscience, Faith, or Discipline. They wrote Letters in answer to such questions as were put to 'em. Toward the latter end of the fourth Century there began a custom of registring and preserving these Letters in the Archives of that Church. This was in the following times found to be of great use; for these Letters served the succeeding Bishops for precedents, when their Judgment was desired in the like Cases.

After many Ages it came into the Mind of some of that Church, to think how great pity it was that that custom of registring those Letters had not began sooner, for there were none extant in the Registers that were earlier than about the time I mention'd.

The way that they took to make up that deficiency was such, as that the mention thereof must make a Christian blush, whenever the Credit of his Religion is attacked by a Heathen. Some among 'em that had no regard to true or false, put in practice that foul Artifice that is used by Faithless and Fabulous Historians; who, when they would set forth the Antiquities of their Nation, and find no Records nor race of Kings so ancient as they could wish, do make out of their own Brain Histories of Times, Names of Kings, Accounts of Wars and Successions, as far back as they please to feign. Of which we see instances in the Fabulous Histories of the *Romans, Britons, Scots, Ægyptians, Chinese, &c.* This is

Year after the Apostles 284.

is scandalous and hateful enough in Secular Histories: But in the concerns of Religion, is the highest pitch of impiety and mischief.

Finding that their Bishops of the first Ages had none of these *Decretal Epistles* upon Record, as many of the following ones had, they made some for 'em, and put 'em out under their Names. And as there was a very corrupt State of that Church at the time when these Acts were forged, the Authors of 'em fail'd not to make the ancient Popes say all that they had a mind they should have said. So that you shall there frequently find some Bishop of *Rome* of the Primitive times, who was, in reality, an Humble, Poor and Persecuted Bishop, strutting and vapouring about the Supremacy of his See, and talking of the Worship due to Holy Images, *&c.*

When any thing is discover'd and made plain, we are apt to wonder that it was not discover'd sooner. It was a time of great Ignorance and Barbarity, when these forged Epistles were put upon the World. And in the beginning of the Reformation the Protestants were much puzzled with 'em. They saw plain enough that the corrupt Doctrines and Practices then receiv'd, had no Foundation in the Scripture, nor in the Writings of the ancient Christians for several Ages; but they knew not what to say to these Epistles, many of which were dated in and nigh the times of the Apostles, and yet had in 'em rank Popery. Those first Bishops of all, *Clement*, *Anaclet*, *Evarest*, *Alexander*, *Xystus*, and the holy Martyr *Telesphorus*, *&c.* did there all speak the Language of *Gregory* the VII.

'Tis true that here and there one of the best learned and most Free Men among the Papists themselves, had before that time declar'd their Objections against some of these Epistles. For Example, Cardinal *Cusanus*, after he had shewn by plain proofs that the Charter of *Constantine's Donation* was a Forgery, adds, (11) *As perhaps are some other of the large Writings attributed to St.* Clement *and* Anaclet. *For the Letters themselves examin'd by the Circumstances of the times of those Men do bewray themselves.* But these Exceptions of one or two Men avail'd nothing against the general Vote; they were universally receiv'd, the Canonists made constant use of 'em, and the Canon Law of that time was in great measure made out of 'em.

1334.

(11) De Concordiâ Catholicâ. l. 3. c. 2.

*Luther*

*Luther* exclaim'd against 'em after his way; and caused them and the whole Body of the *Decretals* to be publickly burnt; but he had not Learning enough to trace and descry the Forgery of 'em. But Bishop *Jewel* being to answer his Adversary *Harding*, who had press'd him with Authorities out of them, made use of his skill in Ecclesiastical History to disclose plain proofs of Forgery in several of 'em. And the Criticks since, both those of the Romish and Reformed Church, have, by a particular Examination put it out of doubt, that all of 'em, beyond the times I spoke of, are spurious.

Year after the Apostles 284. 1417. 1456.

They are never mentioned by any Writer of any Antiquity; they are Written, not in the Style that was in use in the time of the *Roman* Empire, but in that of the Barbarous Age. The dates of almost all of 'em are inconsistent with History. The ignorant forger has made most of 'em speak of Men and Things, Customs and Forms that were not in being at that time. Beside, that each Epistle has in it self some particular proof of its being forged.

§. 2. Now that which the Criticks and Learned Men are agreed on, is, that the Epistles of Pope *Siricius*, who was made Bishop *Anno* 384, are the first of all the *Decretal* Epistles that are genuine, *i. e.* that were really written by the Men whose name they bear. 'Tis true, that there are Epistles extant, one of *Clement*, out of which I gave a Quotation, *CH.* 1. §. 1. and some of *Cornelius*, and one or two more, which are undoubted, and are mention'd and valued by all the Ancients; but the Forger of the *Decretals* took no notice of them; either because they were nothing for his turn, or perhaps he was so ignorant as not to know of 'em. Those which he has made are of more use to the design of the Court of *Rome*, but otherwise of no worth.

But indeed the Church of *Rome* affords in all but a very few Writers of any Antiquity. And if she be the Mother, she was in those times outdone by many of her Daughters, for number of Learned Men. Since *Clement* and *Hermas*, who liv'd in the Apostles time, and St. *Hierom*, who had his Education in that Church, there has been none that I have had occasion to mention in this Tract till this *Siricius*.

Year after the Apostles 284.

§.3. He has several Epistles extant that are genuine, and are mention'd by Writers so Ancient and so Learned as not to be impos'd on by the forementioned Forgery. And the marks of Popish Worship that are so frequent in the elder forged Epistles, are all vanish'd again in those of *Siricius* and *Innocent*, and of several Popes that succeeded them. That which I have occasion to quote is the first of 'em, which is written to *Himerius*, Bishop of *Arragon* in *Spain*

He gives him several directions about Ecclesiastical Matters, and finds fault with many things that by his Information he understood to be manag'd disorderly in that Church. It is divided into 15 Chapters or Paragraphs; whereof the second is this,

## *Siricii Episcopi Decretalis Epistola prima capitulo secundo.*

*Sequitur de diversis baptizandorum temporibus, prout unicuique libitum fuerit, improbabilis & emendanda confusio; quæ à nostris consacerdotibus (quod commoti dicimus) non ratione autoritatis alicujus, sed solâ temeritate præsumitur. Ut passim ac liberè natalitiis Christi, seu Apparitionis nec non & Apostolorum seu Martyrum festivitatibus, innumeræ (ut asseris) plebes baptismi mysterium consequantur. Cum hoc sibi privilegium & apud nos & apud omnes Ecclesias Dominicum specialiter cum Pentecoste suâ Pascha defendat. Quibus solis per annum diebus ad fidem confluentibus generalia baptismatis tradi convenit sacramenta. His duntaxat electis qui ante quadraginta vel eo amplius dies nomen dederint, & exorcismis quotidianisque orationibus atque jejuniis fuerint expiati, quatenus Apostolica illa impleatur præceptio, ut expurgato fermento veteri nova incipiat esse conspersio.*

*Sicut ergo Paschalem reverentiam in nullo dicimus esse minuendam, ita infantibus qui necdum loqui potuerint per ætatem, vel his quibus in qualibet necessitate opus fuerit sacri undâ baptismatis omni volumus celeritate succurri: Ne ad nostrarum perniciem tendat animarum, si negato desiderantibus fonte salutari exiens unusquisque de seculo & regnum perdat & vitam.*

*Quicunque etiam discrimen naufragii, hostilitatis incursum, obsidionis ambiguum, vel cujuslibet corporalis ægritudinis desperationes inciderint, & sibi unico credulitatis*

*tis auxilio poposcerint subveniri, eodem quo poscunt momento temporis expetitæ regenerationis præmia consequantur.* Year after the Apostles 284.

'There is also a blameable disorder which ought to 'be amended, in Baptizing at various times as every one 'fansies; which our fellow Bishops among you do venture to practice, as I am something vext to hear, not 'by the rule of any Authority, but by meer Rashness. So 'that great numbers of People do, as you say, receive 'their Baptism, some at *Christmas*, some at the *Epiphany*, 'and some on the holy days of the Apostles and Martyrs. 'Whereas not only in our Church, but in all Churches, 'our Lord's *Passover* [*viz. Easter*] together with its *Pentecost*, does peculiarly challenge this Privilege to it self, 'On which days of the year alone it is fitting that the 'common Sacraments of Baptism should be given to those 'that come to the Faith. And that those only should be 'admitted who have given in their Names forty days 'or more before, and have been cleansed by Exorcisms '[*or Renunciations of the Devil and Wickedness*] and daily Prayers and Fastings, to the end that that precept 'of the Apostle may be fulfilled of *purging out the old* '*leaven, that there may be a new lump.*

'As therefore I affirm that the respect due to the Feast 'of *Easter*, ought by no means to be diminished; so my 'meaning is, that as for Infants, who by reason of their 'Age, are not yet able to speak, and others that are in 'any case of necessity, they ought to be relievd with all 'speed possible, lest it turn to the Perdition of our own 'Souls, if we deny the Water of Salvation to any one 'that stands in need, and they departing this Life, do 'lose their Kingdom and their Life.

'Whoever also shall be in danger of Shipwrack, or 'of the Assaults of Enemies, or of a Siege, or shall be 'likely to Die of any bodily Sickness, and shall desire to 'be assisted with that which is the only armour of our 'Faith [*or, Religion*] that they have the gift of Regeneration which they desire, the same moment that they 'desire it.

I have set down this the more at large, because we see by it, that at the same time when they insist upon those Preparations, and personal Qualifications of the adult, they do except the Case of Infants. 'Tis common for some Antipædobaptist Writers to quote such Passages as the forepart of this, taken by it self, would be, as Te-

Year after the Apostles 284.

stimonies, that such Authors allow'd no Baptism of Infants, because they require those preparatory Exercises of all that are to be Baptized. This I have seen done a hundred times, when the same Author that is quoted does, sometimes in the same Treatise, as here; and sometimes in other parts of his Works, shew that Infants are to be Baptiz'd, as being in a Case that is exempt from the general rule that requires Faith, Prayer, Repentance, and other personal Preparation. 'Tis no wonder that they do thus with other Books, when they can hardly forbear doing it with the *Catechism* of the Church of *England*, which requires *Repentance* and *Faith* of Persons to be Baptiz'd, but shews by the next Words, that the case of *Infants* is an exempt case. This practice, tho' not always so palpable, yet is in effect always as unfair as that with which *Wills* charges *Danvers*, (12) *viz.* for quoting the Canon of a certain Council as Enacting, that *none should receive Baptism without rehearsing the Creed and Lord's Prayer*, and stopping there; when the next Words are, *Except those who, by reason of Age, cannot yet speak.*

(12) Appeal to Baptists against *H. D.* Chap. 1.

That which *Siricius* here says, that it was the custom of the Church of *Rome*, and of all other Churches to give Baptism only at *Easter* and *Whitsontide*, excepting Infants, sick People, and other such extraordinary cases, may be prov'd from a great many other Authors. I shall mention no more but *Tertullian*, for his Antiquity. He says, (13) *The most solemn time for Baptism is* Easter, *at which time the passion of our Lord, into which we are Baptized, was performed* ——— *After that the* Pentecost *affords a large time for ordering the lavers.* ——— *But yet every day is the Lords. Any hour, any time whatever is capable to be made use of for Baptism. Tho' there be some difference as to the solemnity, there is none as to the Grace given.*

(13) De baptismo c. 19.

§. 4. I said that this Epistle appears to be genuine and not forged, among the others of the foregoing Popes, by the mention that is made of it, by Authors so Ancient and so Learned, as not to be impos'd on by that Forgery. This very Passage of it is quoted by *Hincmarus Rhemensis* (14) *Anno* 835. and by the Council of *Tribur* (15) *Anno* 895. And I suppose other parts of it may have been quoted by earlier Writers, which I have not had occasion to observe. The pretended *Isidore*, out of whose Shop the Forged Collection of Epistles is supposed first

835.

(14) Opuscul. 55. Capitulorum, cap. 31.

(15) Can. 12.

to

to have come, liv'd about these times, and seems to have been Contemporary with *Hincmarus*, but something the Elder: But as all forged Works do require some time after their first hatching, to be known, or at least to gain any Authority; there is no likelihood that so Learned Men (as *Hincmarus* especially was) should quote any thing upon a dependance on so fresh an Imposture. Especially when neither he nor the Council do quote it as from *Isidore*, but as an Epistle generally known in the World. And besides, the Learned Criticks, *Quesnellus*, *Du Pin*, *&c.* that do question one of *Siricius*'s Epistles, as being to be suspected of Forgery for reasons they give, do make no question of this. Year after the Apostles 284.

By the said Quotations of *Hincmarus* and *Concil. Triburiens.* it also appears that the custom of limiting the Baptism of adult Persons to *Easter*, and the times aforesaid, continued in the Church till their time, and it did continue something longer. But of later times we hear no more of it. I suppose, because the Baptisms of adult Persons grew to be very few; the Heathen Nations being now become Christian; and hardly any but Infants being Baptiz'd, which were not contain'd in that rule. For it was but about 300 years after this time that *Petrus Cluniacensis* writing against some that at that time, *Anno Dom.* 1130. set up a Doctrine, that Baptism given to an Infant is no Baptism, oppos'd to 'em this among other things, That *if it were so, then, whereas all* Europe *has had never a Person now for* 300, *or hardly any for* 500 *years, Baptiz'd otherwise than in Infancy, it has had never a Christian in it.* The place I quote more largely hereafter. (16) 1030.

(16) Pt. 2. CH. VII. §. 5.

§. 5. This order of the Ancient Church, that no adult Person, except in case of necessity, should be Baptiz'd but at these set and appointed times, was made for a very good and weighty reason, *viz.* because there was not so much care likely to be taken of his Instruction and Examination if he were Baptiz'd at some other time of the year alone by himself, as there was if he were Baptized at *Easter*, when the other *Catechumeni* were Baptiz'd. Because for some Weeks before *Easter*, the Ministers of the Church made it their business to Catechise, Examine and Prepare the Candidates for Baptism. They were to give in their names *forty* Days before; and they were to be able to repeat the Creed, *&c.* and to give account of their Faith twenty

Year after the Apostles 284.

Days before (something more or less, according to the Canons of the several Churches) and the People came together to hear these Examinations and Professions; and care was taken that they did spend the time in Prayers, Fastings, and such other holy Exercises as would fit 'em for so great a change of their State. And, because there were at *Easter* a great number of 'em, and the spiritual good of the Church did in great measure depend upon their doing well; it was counted an occasion weighty enough to require that the whole Church should at that time pray and fast with them and for them, as I quoted out of *Justin Martyr.* (17) *They are directed to pray, and ask of God* with Fasting *the forgiveness of their former Sins, and we also pray and fast together with them.*

(17) CH II. §. 2.

And this, I believe, was none of the least occasions of keeping the *fast of Lent* before *Easter.*

And we see also to this day some remains of the catechizing used then; for tho' the Church of *England* do now appoint catechizing all the year long, yet most of the Curates therein omit it all the year, except the time of *Lent*, but at that time that Office is by old custom kept on Foot. It was to prepare the Candidates for Baptism at *Easter*, that the *Lent* catechizing was used.

Also in the Liturgy of the same Church, and in that of the Church of *Rome* the Collect for the third *Sunday* after *Easter*, remains in that Form which seems to have been compos'd at first with a particular respect to the new-baptiz'd Persons. *Almighty God, who shewest to them that be in error the light of thy truth, to the intent that they may return into the way of Righteousness; grant unto all them* that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ's Religion, *that they may eschew these things that are contrary to their Profession, and follow all such things as are agreeable to the same, thro' our Lord Jesus Christ.* This is a good Prayer at all Times, and for all Persons; but I believe the first composing it for that *Sunday*, was in regard to the *Neophytes.* The Collects for *Easter*, and the two *Sundays* following, referring to the Resurrection, the next was for them.

§. 6. The 9th Chapter or Canon of the same Epistle of *Siricius*, is, to blame the People of *Spain* for chosing into the Ministry some such as had been but lately converted to the Christian Religion; and he gives 'em this Direction,

*Quicunque*

*Quicunque igitur se Ecclesiæ vovit* [*l. vovet*] *obsequiis, à suâ infantiâ ante pubertatis annos Baptizari & Lectorum debet ministerio sociari.* Year after the Apostles 284.

'He that devotes himself to the Service of the Church, 'ought to be Baptized [*i. e. ought to be one that was Bap-'tiz'd*] in his Infancy, before ripeness of Age, and im-'ploy'd in the Office of the Readers.

This rule was a little after repeated to the People of *Spain*, by *Innocentius*, in Words just to the same purpose, only a little plainer, which I shall recite presently.

§. 7. After *Siricius*, *Anastasius* sate but about 3 or 4 years, and was succeeded by *Innocentius* the First. He must have been a Man of note in the Church before the year 400, for it was in the year 402 that he was made Bishop of *Rome*. He also has some Decretal Epistles (besides those to the Council of *Carthage*, which I shall cite hereafter) that mention Infant Baptism, and are by all acknowledged to be genuine.

His first is written to *Decentius*, Bishop of *Eugubium*, giving him his Resolution in several things, wherein he had demanded it: Whereof the third is, that tho' the Presbyters might Baptize Infants, yet only Bishops might give them the Chrism, or anointing on the Forehead, which was in those times given after Baptism: It is as follows,

## *Epistolæ Decretalis Innocentii ad Decentium, Can.* 3.

*De consignandis verò infantibus, manifestum est non ab alio quam Episcopo fieri licere. Nam presbyteri, licet sint sacerdotes, pontificatûs tamen apicem non habent. Hæc autem pontificibus solis deberi, ut vel consignent vel paracletum spiritum tradant, non solùm consuetudo Ecclesiastica demonstrat, verùm & illa lectio Actuum Apostolorum, quæ asserit Petrum & Joannem esse directos qui jam baptizatis traderent spiritum sanctum. Nam presbyteris seu extra Episcopum seu præsente Episcopo cùm baptizant, Chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab Episcopo fuerit consecratum; non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur Episcopis, &c.* Year after the Apostles 300.

Year after the Apostles 300.

'As for the anointing of Infants on the Forehead, 'with the Chrism, it is plain that that ought to be 'done by none but the Bishop. For Presbyters, 'tho' they be as Priests, yet they have not the Pre-'eminence of the chief Priests. And that it is Lawful 'for the chief Priests only, either to anoint on the 'Forehead, or give the Holy Spirit, appears not only by 'the custom of the Church, but also by that Place in 'the *Acts of the Apostles*, which tells (18) us, that *Peter* 'and *John* were sent to give the Holy Spirit to such 'as were already Baptiz'd. For when Presbyters do 'give Baptism either in the presence of the Bishop, or 'out of his presence, they may anoint the Baptized Per-'sons with Chrism, provided it be such as has been 'Consecrated by the Bishop; but they must not anoint 'the Forehead with the same; for that is peculiar to 'the Bishops, *&c.*

(18) Acts 8. 14.

Tho' this place do not mention the Baptism of these Infants, yet it plainly supposes it. The Chrism was never given to any till they were Baptized.

The rule that he sets here that none but the Bishop must give the Chrism on the Forehead, was the ordinary and general rule of that Church; but yet dispenc'd with in the case of want of Bishops, or their default of doing their Office, as I shew hereafter (19).

(19) Pt. 2. CH. IX. §. 8.

§. 8. The other passage of *Innocentius*, which is to the same effect with that which I recited from *Siricius*, is in his 24th *Epistle*, which was written to a Synod then met at *Toledo*; whereof the 5th Chapter is a rule given for the Qualifications of such as were to be admitted to the Ministry. He had determin'd in the foregoing Canons, that no Lawyer, Soldier, or Officer of the Temporal Court, should be received to holy Orders, and then gives the Qualifications following,

## *Epistolæ Innocentii primi ad Synodum Toletanam Can. quintus.*

*Quales verò eligendi sunt in ordine clericorum evidens forma declarat, i. e. qui ab ineunte ætate baptizati fuerint, & Lectorum officio sociati, vel si majores sunt cum fuerint Dei gratiam consecuti, statim se Ecclesiasticis ordinibus mancipaverint. Et si uxores habuerint, quærendum si uxorem virginem habuerint: Quia scriptum est in veteri Testamento;*

*stamento; uxorem virginem accipiat sacerdos: Et alibi, sacerdotes mei semel nubant. Neque qui duas uxores habuerit: Quia Paulus Apostolus ait; Unius uxoris virum.* Year after the Apostles 300.

'And as to the Qualifications of such as are to be chosen 'into the Ministry, there is a certain rule, *viz.* That they 'be such as have been Baptiz'd from their Infancy, and 'have been Educated in the Office of Readers: Or, if 'they were older before they obtain'd the Grace of God, 'then that they be such as did presently upon it addict 'themselves to Offices of the Church. And if they have 'had Wives, it must be inquir'd, whether they Married 'Virgins? For it is Written in the Old (20) Testament, 'He *shall take a Wife in her Virginity.* And at another 'place, *Let my Priests Marry but once.* Not one that has 'had two Wives: For St. *Paul* says, (21) *The Husband of* 'one *Wife.*

(20) Levit. 21. 13.

(21) 1 Tim. 3. 2, 12. Tit. 1. 6.

It has been often enough said already, That there were in those times, besides those that were Baptiz'd in Infancy, several that turn'd from Heathenism to Christianity at their ripe Age; such the Canon would not have to be put into Holy Orders; but only such as were Baptized in Infancy, unless those so converted have, from their first coming to the Faith, addicted themselves to the service of the Church, in the lower Offices: To prevent the inconvenience mention'd by St. *Paul*, in preferring Novices, (22) or Neophytes, *i. e.* Persons but lately Baptiz'd or made Christians.

(22) 1 Tim. 3. 6.

§. 9. The latter part of this Canon takes St. *Paul's* rule given 1 *Tim.* 3. 2, 12. and *Tit.* 1. 6. for the Qualification of a Bishop or Deacon, *viz.* That he should be *the Husband of one Wife*, in that sense in which all Antiquity does generally take it, that no Man that has been twice Married should be admitted to Holy Orders.

CHAP.

## CHAP. XVIII.

### *Out of* Paulinus *Bishop of* Nola, *and another* Paulinus, *Deacon of the Church of* Milan.

§. 1. PAulinus, Bishop of *Nola*, had been a Heathen Man, during which time he had addicted his Mind to Poetry and Oratory; after he became a Christian, he made use of those Faculties on Religious Subjects. And *Sulpitius Severus*, who had built a Church, desired him to compose some proper godly Sentences to be written in several places of the Church, and particularly at the Font, or place of Baptizing. *Paulinus* sends him a Letter in Answer, containing several such Sentences: It is,

*Epist.* 32. *quæ est duodecima ex iis quæ sunt ad Severum.*

And in one of 'em compos'd in Verse for the Font, there is this Distich,

*Inde parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos*
*Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu.*

'The Priest from th' holy Font do's th' Infants (bring,
'In Body, in Soul, in Garments white and (clean.

As he refers to the cleanness of the Body, by washing in the Font, and of the Soul, on account of the forgiveness of Sins granted in that holy Sacrament; so what he speaks of the whiteness of their Garments, is according to the custom then us'd all over the Church, of clothing the new Baptiz'd Persons, whether Infants or grown People, in *Albes*, or, white Garments.

§. 2.

§. 2. If there were not Testimonies enough of the custom of Baptizing Infants in this Age, this alone would not be sufficient to prove it. For there being nothing but the word *Infants* singly mention'd, without any other Circumstances setting forth their Age; and there being a custom about these times of calling by a Metaphorical Speech, all the new Baptiz'd Persons, *Infants*, whether they were Young or Old: It is a question whether *Paulinus* did by that word intend to restrain the Sense to Infants in Age, or whether he meant only to describe the Procession of the Priest leading from the Font a number of new Baptiz'd Persons in general, in their *Albes*. Year after the Apostles 293.

That there was such a custom of calling new Baptized Persons, by the name of *Infants*, about this time, appears by several Instances. *Gaudentius*, who was Bishop of *Brescia*, about this time, has an Oration, or Sermon, (1) in which he thus bespeaks the *Novices*, or new Baptized Persons, *You are put in mind by the name of* Infants, *by which you are called, that you are by your Baptism regenerated and born a-new; and therefore if any of you that are Married*, &c. Also St. *Austin* has a Sermon or Discourse intitl'd, *Ad Infantes*, To the Infants, *i. e.* to a Congregation of Persons then newly Baptized. (1) Orat. 8. ad Neophytos.

This does not at all invalidate the Testimonies which have been given for Infant Baptism; for in all that I have quoted, except this and one or two more, there is, beside the word *Infant*, some Circumstance that does shew the Speech to be about Infants in Age. It rather confirms the thing, and is it self a Testimony; for one reason of the Name was, that the number of Christians being now much encreased, and the Baptism of Christian Infants being more frequent than of Elder Persons new converted, these latter had the name of Infants in allusion to the former.

## *Paulinus de obitu Celsi pueri.* On the Death of *Celsus*, a Child.

This *Celsus* was a Child very dear to his Parents, that died at seven year old, or when he was newly enter'd into his 8th, as appears by some passages of the Discourse.

His

Year after the Apostles 293.

His Parents were so overmuch concern'd at his death, that *Paulinus* found it necessary to write to them a Consolatory advice; it is written in Verse, and after the first Distich follow these two,

*Quem Dominus tanto cumulavit munere Christus,*
*Ut rudis ille annis, & novus iret aquis:*
*Atque bis infantem, spatio ævi, & fonte lavacri,*
*Congeminata Deo gratia perveheret.*

'So great a Favour Christ did to him show,
'That he, escaping all the snares below,
'Should hence so Young, and fresh from Baptism go:
'Two Graces do his Infant Soul commend,
'So little sullied, and so lately clean'd.

This Quotation is not fully to the purpose either of the Pædobaptists or Antipædobaptists; for the one will inquire why this Child's Baptism was delay'd so long as till he was almost seven years old; and the other, why he was Baptiz'd so soon. And there is not any such account of the Condition of his Parents, as to satisfie either of 'em. They might perhaps be, as *Paulinus* himself was, lately converted, or it might be deferred by Negligence and Procrastination. St. *Austin*, somewhere, but I have forgot where, speaks of fourteen years as the soonest that People were *ordinarily* Baptiz'd on their own Profession; yet at another place, where his Adversary would prove that unbaptized Children might go to Heaven, by the instance of *Dinocrates*, a Boy born of Heathen Parents, and dying at seven year old, whose Soul was said in a certain Story-book, to have been seen in Heaven in a Vision, by his Sister in her Prayers; he says, *It is not impossible but that at that Age he might have been Baptiz'd at his own choice*, which place I have occasion to recite hereafter (2).

It is plain enough by what has been said, that the ordinary time of Baptizing Infants was within a little time after their Birth. And the Antipædobaptists, I suppose, do not think a Child of seven year old, any fitter than a mere Infant.

(2) CH. XX. §. 3.

The

The cuſtom that I mention'd of calling new Baptiz'd Perſons by the name of *Infants*, is alluded to here: For *Paulinus* calls this Child, *bis infantem*, in two reſpects an Infant, *viz. ſpatio ævi & fonte lavacri*, an Infant in Age, and an Infant as newly Baptized. Year after the Apoſtles 293.

*Paulinus* has ſome Letters and Tracts attributed to him, that are ſpurious; but this is recited among his Works, by *Gennadius*, in theſe (3) words; *Paulinus*, Biſhop of *Nola*, *in* Campania *wrote many things in way of ſhort Poems; and a Conſolatory Tract to* Celſus, *in form of an Epitaph, on the death of his Chriſtian and Baptized Infant, full of Chriſtian hope*, &c. 395. (3) Catalog. virorum illuſtrium.

## *Paulini Epiſtola ad Hieronymum de duabus Quæſtionibus apud Hieronym. Ep.* 153.

§. 4. *Paulinus* in this Letter deſir'd St. *Hierom*'s Opinion of the meaning of two ſayings which the Scripture uſes.

One was, what is ſaid, *Exod.* 9. 12. He asks, *Why* [or in what ſenſe] Pharaoh'*s heart was hardned by God?* And alſo, how that which the Apoſtle ſays, (4) is to be underſtood, *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth Mercy*; which ſeems to take away Free-will. (4) Rom. 9. 16.

The other was concerning that Text, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Elſe were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* On which *Paulinus* asks this queſtion,

*Quomodo ſancti ſint qui de fidelibus, id eſt, de baptizatis naſcuntur; cùm ſine dono gratiæ poſtea acceptæ & cuſtoditæ ſalvi eſſe non poſſunt?*

'How thoſe Children that are born of Fidel, that 'is, of Baptized Parents, are Holy; whenas, without 'the gift of Grace [*of Baptiſm*] afterward [*viz. after 'their Birth*] received and preſerved, they cannot be 'ſaved?

He ſeems at this place to have taken the obvious ſenſe of St. *Paul*'s Words to be, that the Infants of Chriſtian Parents are holy from their Birth, and deſires to know what Holineſs this is that St. *Paul* aſcribes to 'em from their Birth, ſince tho' the Parents be Baptized Chriſtians, yet unleſs the Children alſo be themſelves Baptized, they cannot be ſaved.

This

Year after the Apostles 293.

This is the most material of the Evidences we have from him on this Subject, for if it be concluded, as he does here conclude, that Infants cannot be saved without Baptism, it will undoubtedly follow in any one's sense, that they ought to be Baptiz'd without delay.

§. 5. This Letter of *Paulinus* is not extant, that I know of, and perhaps was never published. But St. *Hierom*, in his Answer to it, which is his *Epist.* 153. *ad Paulinum*, recites out of it what I have here set down.

He makes his Answer very short, and that for two reasons which he gives: One was, that by every Ship that sailed for the West, he had so many Letters of this nature to send, that he could not bestow pains on any one, but was forc'd to write whatever came *Extempore* into his Mind. The other was, that to so great a Critick as *Paulinus*, he did not dare write a long Letter, in which the more faults would be found.

It shews us by the way, how diligent People were at that time in seeking to have the true sense of Scripture, and of how great repute St. *Hierom*'s Learning was; when *Paulinus*, and so many others, sent Letters a thousand mile to him to desire his opinion.

St. *Hierom* refers him for an answer to his first question to *Origen*'s Book περὶ ἀρχῶν, which he had then newly Translated into *Latin*, and whereof he might have a Copy in *Pammachius*'s hands, to whom he had dedicated and sent it. And for the second his answer is this,

*Of your second question* Tertullian *has discours'd in his Book* de Monogamiâ [*leg.* de Animâ] *holding that the Children of Christians are styled* Holy, *as being Candidates* [or, Expectants] *of the Faith, and not polluted with any Idolatrous filth or trumpery.*

*Also you may mind that we read of the vessels of the Tabernacle being called* Holy, *and many other Utensils of the Ceremonies; whereas nothing can be properly* Holy, *but what has Sense, and fears God. It is therefore a phrase of Scripture, sometimes to call those* Holy *that are Clean and Purified, or expiated from Uncleanness, as* Bathsheba *is said to be* Sanctified [or, made Holy] *from her Uncleanness.*

*I intreat you not to impute to me either trifling, or wrong Interpretation; for God is witness to my Conscience, that the hurry I have mention'd to you, has hindred me from so much as setting on, or attempting the Interpretation of*

*of the place. And you know nothing is done to any purpose in a hurry.* Year after the Apostles 293.

St. *Hierom* had some reason to make an Apology for so slight and perfunctory an Explication; yet as it is, it shews that he, as well as *Paulinus*, thought that such Children could not be call'd Holy in any such sense as should intitle 'em to Salvation, unless they were Baptized. If he had thought they could, the ready way to take off *Paulinus*'s doubt, had been to answer so; the doubt being this, How they are Holy from their Birth, since without Baptism they cannot be sav'd? But he answers,

1. By referring him to *Tertullian*'s account of this place in his Book *de Animâ*, which I recited before, (5) where he Paraphrases the Text in this Sense, *They are Holy, that is, they are design'd for Holiness; for, as for any other meaning, our Lord has determin'd, that without Baptism none shall enter into the Kingdom of God, (6) which is as much as to say, None shall be Holy.*

(5) CH. IV. §. 6.

(6) John 3. 5.

2. By giving some instances where the word *Holy* is applied to some things that are not capable of Salvation, or of moral Good or Evil.

*Calvin*, and many that have followed him, have boldly ventur'd on that Explication which *Paulinus* durst not embrace, nor St. *Hierom* advise, and which *Tertullian* disproves. They have determin'd, that a Believer's Child is Holy, *i. e.* is born to Salvation, whether it be Baptiz'd or not; that Baptism is to be given it indeed, but only as a seal of that Holiness, which it has by Covenant before it be Baptized. And to this purpose, they expound that Text, *John* 3. 5. of any thing rather than of Baptism: And many of 'em have determin'd that the Authority of Baptizing Infants is grounded only on that Birth Privilege which they have before; and that no other Infants than such as are so Holy by their Birth, may, or ought to be Baptized; which Doctrine involves the Baptizer in endless Scruples, which Infants he may Baptize and Which not, as Bishop *Stillingfleet* has largely shewn in the Book to which I refer'd before (7).

(7) CH. XI. §. 11.

He that has read the foregoing Chapters, is by this time satisfied, that all the Ancients understood our Saviour's Words, *John* 3. 5. of Baptism, or will be, by what I shall produce; (8) and that they never refus'd to Baptize a Child on account of their Parents Wickedness,

(8) See Pt. 2. CH. VI. §. 1.

Year after the Apostles 293.

nefs, or even Heathenifm or Infidelity, if the Child were offer'd to Baptifm by fuch as were the then owners of the Child (9).

(9) See Pt. 2. CH. VI. §. 10.

Much lefs do the Explications given by the Ancients, of the Holinefs here fpoken of, fit or fquare to that jejune one given by fome Antipædobaptifts, that St. *Paul* fhould mean no more but that the Children of Believers, tho' one of the Parents do continue in unbelief, are Legitimate and not Baftards; which looks as made merely to ferve a turn.

On the contrary, the general vein of ancient Interpretations, is, to underftand by this Holinefs, baptifmal Holinefs, either as given, or defign'd to be given: As has appear'd partly by this Quotation, and by fome others given before (10) and will more fully hereafter, where I mean to confer together all the Ancient Expofitions of this Text that I know of (11).

(10) CH. IV. §. 12. CH. XI. §. 11. CH. XV. §. 2.

(11) CH. XIX. §. 19.

## *Paulinus in vitâ Ambrofii.*

Year after the Apostles 297.

§. 6. The other *Paulinus* was a Deacon of the Church of *Milan*, that miniftred to St. *Ambrofe* in his life time, and after he was dead, wrote the Hiftory of his Life, which is commonly Printed with his Works. *Erafmus* takes this Piece for a Forgery (12) of later years, becaufe many of the Paffages he relates, look fo like the Fabulous Stories of the Monks; and I am almoft of his Opinion, partly for his reafon, and partly for another that I mention hereafter. (13) It muft either be fo, or elfe this *Paulinus* muft have been a very vain and credulous Man. Neither would I fet down the Paffage here following, which feems as fabulous and idle as any of 'em, were it not that moft of the Criticks and Learned Men have an Opinion of the Authenticalnefs of the Tract, and do commonly quote it.

(12) Cenfurâ operibus Ambrofii præfixâ.

(13) Pt. 2. CH. III. §. 9.

He relates a great many different occafions, on which St. *Ambrofe*'s Ghoft or Shape appeared to feveral Perfons, after he was dead; and, among the reft, how he having departed this Life on *Easter Eve*, his Body was carried and laid in the great Church.

297.

*Ibique eadem fuit nocte quam vigilamus in Pafcha. Quem plurimi infantes baptizati, quum à fonte venirent, viderunt: Ita ut aliqui fedentem in Cathedrâ tribunali dicerent; alii vero afcendentem fuis parentibus digito oftenderent,*

*derent. Sed illi videntes videre non poterant, quia mundatos oculos non habebant.*

Year after the Apostles 297.

'And there it was that night which we spend in 'watching at *Easter* [*this was the night before* Easter 'day, *on which, in the Primitive times, the whole body of 'the People did always sit up all night in the Church at 'their Prayers.*] And a great many of the Infants that 'were Baptized [on *Easter day*] saw him as they came 'back from the Font, some of 'em saying, *There he sits 'in the Bishop's Chair*: Others of 'em shew'd him to their 'Parents, pointing with their hands, that he was *going 'there up the steps*: But the Parents looking, could not 'see him, because they had not their Eyes cleansed [*or 'enlightned.*]

There you have the Story, such as it is, grounded probably on the superstitious Conceits of Women and Boys: but yet it shews that there were Children among those that were Baptiz'd on that day. He calls 'em Infants, but some of 'em could not be absolute Infants, for he mentions their speaking: They seem to have been little Boys carried in their Parents Arms, or lead in their Hands.

These Infants, according to this Story, being by their Baptism, just then received, clear from all Sin, had their Eyes enlightned to see this Miracle; but their Parents having been since their Baptism stained with many Sins, were not capable of it. They called Baptism, both in the Scripture times, as appears from *Heb.* 6. 4. and also in these times, φωτισμὸς, *the Illumination*, or *Inlightning* of a Person.

O CHAP.

Year after the Apostles 310.

# CHAP. XIX.

## *Out of St.* Hierom *and St.* Austin, *after the rise of the* Pelagian *Controversie; as also out of* Pelagius, Celestius, Innocent *the First*, Zosimus, Julianus, Theodorus Mopsuestensis, *&c. And out of the Councils of* Carthage, Diospolis, Milevis, *&c.*

§. 1. A New Heresie happening in the Church at this time, gave more occasion to speak of Infant Baptism than ever had been before. Not that any of the Parties disapproved it; but one of 'em held that there is no original Sin in Infants, and that brought in much discourse about their Baptism.

*Pelagius*, a Monk, living at *Rome*, was the Author of this Heresie; at least the first Promoter of it in the West. And one *Celestius*, another Monk, was his chief Abetter; and afterward, *Julianus* a Bishop, and *Anianus* a Deacon. It was not started till the year of Christ 410. But most of the Managers on each side were Men of Note before the year 400.

The Men that I named were the only Writers of the *Pelagian* side, but a considerable number of the People was brought over to incline to their Opinions. They argued, that the Doctrine of original Sin and natural Corruption, by which Persons are supposed to be born under a necessity of sinning, did cast a reflection on the Honour and Justice of God, who gives us our Being; and this Argument was plausible among the vulgar.

Consequently to this, they said that Baptism of Infants was not for any Sin they had, but to gain them admittance into the Kingdom of Heaven: For they said that Children, tho' they were not baptiz'd, should have an Eternal and Happy Life; not in the Kingdom of Heaven

Heaven indeed, because our Saviour, *John* 3. 5. had determin'd the contrary, but somewhere, they knew not where.

Year after the Apostles 310.

This, with the rest of their Opinions, is briefly set forth by St. *Austin lib. de hæresibus c.* 88.

§. 2. For better apprehending the sense of the Quotations, which we shall produce, a short History of the steps and progress of this Sect would be useful, which is also the more necessary, because a late Author has wrote the History of it very partially for those Hereticks; pretending to give (1) an abstract of what Bishop *Usher* had Collected (2) of this History, he has pick'd out of it for the most part only such Circumstances and such Sayings of *Pelagius*, as taken by themselves, sound most favourably for him, and such of St. *Austin* and St. *Hierom* as are most liable to Exception.

(1) Bibliotheque Universel, T. 8.

(2) Britannicæ Ecclesiarum Antiquitates, quibus incerta est pestiferæ adv. Dei gratiam à Pelagio Britanno inductæ hæreseos Historia.

It is great pity that among all the learned and true *Histories of Pelagianism*, only that should have the luck to be Translated into *English*: But the World knows now by whose means that and the *Lives of some Fathers*, Written by the same Author, and in the same vain, have been tack'd together, and put into the hands of our vulgar Readers.

It seems that tho' it be a great fault to write the Lives of the Catholick Fathers *Encomiastically*, yet it is none to write the Lives of the old Hereticks so. And one that in reading the Books of the Ancient Christians, passes by the best, and picks out for a Specimen of their Works, what may be censured in 'em, is a good Author, tho' he that passes by their *Nævi*, and takes most notice of what is most material, does so great a mischief: Or else it is, that the Booksellers of *Amsterdam* will give more Money for the Copy of a Book of the first than of the latter sort, not regarding which does most good or hurt to the cause of Christianity; but which Men will have the most Curiosity to see and to buy. As 'tis said of *Bleau*, that he procur'd a *Socinian* Book which he had Printed, to be burnt by the Hangman, that the Edition might sell the better (3).

(3) La Religion des Hollandois, p. 83.

This Author notes, (4) that we have no account of *Celestius*'s Doctrine, but from his Adversaries, tho' St. *Austin* quotes largely the Acts of the Council where he spoke, and his own Books; and, that possibly the sayings objected to him in the Council, were but consequences drawn from what he had said, tho' his

(4) Pag. 182. Ed. 1688.

Year after the Apostles 310.

Book and the Chapters of it be quoted in the Council, and concludes that St. *Austin* and *Pelagius* did not understand one anothers terms and meaning, and that in many parts of this dispute, they were like two Men of different Languages, that should scold as loud as they could, without understanding what each other said; and reciting the Emperor's Edict against the *Pelagians*, says, *Suspicious Persons will think this Edict express'd in so pathetick terms comes from the Pen of some Ecclesiastical Zealot*. One may know who he means. And endeavouring to shew that St. *Austin* and St. *Hierom*, the chief Opposers of the *Pelagian* Doctrine, do contradict one another about a main point of it, *viz.* the possibility of keeping the Commandments; he, by a gross mistake, quotes (5) *Pelagius*'s Words against *Hierom*, as if they were St. *Austin*'s (as I shall by and by shew, having occasion to recite (6) those Words) at which rate he may well prove that St. *Austin* contradicts St. *Hierom*.

(5) Pag. 219.

(6) §. 29. Notes on *Pelagius*'s Creed. Note 6.

I call this mistake gross, because Bishop *Usher*, in the Treatise which the Man is here Epitomizing, shews that the 191. *Serm. de Tempore*, among the Works of St. *Austin*, (from whence these Words are taken) is not his, but is long ago known to be *Pelagius*'s Confession of Faith to Pope *Innocent*. And, which makes it the more unpardonable, he himself had a little before (7) followed *Usher* in observing that that Piece, which, among the Works of St. *Hierom*, is called *Symboli Explanatio ad Damasum*, is really *Pelagius*'s said *Confession*; and if he looked into this 191 *Serm. de Tempore*, which he here quotes, he would have seen that and the said *Symboli Explanatio* to be both one. And Bishop *Usher*, where he observes the one, observes the other. The Man that is capable of such palpable Mistakes in the main matters which he is arguing, ought, for shame, give over Criticizing with so censorious a Contempt as he does, on the Works of Men of known and solid Learning, where the matter that he remarks is for the most part only some trifling nicety.

(7) Pag. 180.

§. 3. *Pelagius* was a *Briton* born, the only Man of that Ancient Church that ever made a figure in the *Roman* World. He is supposed to have been called here in his own Country, *Morgan*, because that name in the *British* Language signifies the same that *Pelagi-*

*us*

*us* does in *Latin* and *Greek*, viz. *belonging to the Sea.* He liv'd a good while at *Rome*, in great credit and esteem for Piety, Parts and Learning, respected and loved by the most accomplish'd Men of that time, such as St. *Austin*, *Paulinus*, *Rufinus*, *&c.* Even they that condemn'd his Opinion own'd his Ingenuity. Most Nations that have had any very Learned or Ingenious Man in the most Ancient times, keep his Works as a Monument of remembrance. *Pelagius*'s Works were most of 'em, not all, tinctur'd with his Heresie; and the chief of 'em are lost. Those that remain, tho' they are by nigh two hundred years the Ancientest of any extant written by a Native of this Land, yet have not had the favour to be done into *English*. I have occasion to give by and by his *Confession of Faith* at large, which is so handsomely drawn up that it has pass'd, as was observ'd before, sometimes for St. *Austin*'s, sometimes for St. *Hierom*'s.

Year after the Apostles 310.

A late *Scotch* Writer among us, says, *He was a* Scottish *Monk*; I wonder'd at first where he had this piece of Learning; but I find that *Garner* the Jesuit has lately set up that Opinion, by running into a mistake of the sense of a place in St. *Hierom*, which mistake Bishop *Usher* had rectified long before (8). All that is in it is this, *Celestius* was an *Irish* Man, and they at that time were called *Scoti*, and their Country *Scotia*; and therefore of him indeed St. *Hierom* says, (9) *He is by origin of the* Scotch *Nation*: And again, *Scoticis pultibus prægravatus*, 'having his Belly fill'd, and his Head be-' dull'd with *Scotch porridge*. And *Dempster* the *Scot* took on him to maintain, that not only he, but a great many others that in old Writings are called *Scoti*, were of that *Scotland* which now goes by that name, whom Bishop *Usher* does handsomely expose for that Mistake. And yet it is followed by Mr. *Le Clerc*, as to *Celestius*. But if that were true, it would not concern *Pelagius*, whom St. *Hierom* does at that place distinguish from *Celestius*, as *Pluto* from *Cerberus*.

(8) Brit. Eccl. Antiq. c. 8. pag. 209. Ed. 1639.

(9) Proœm. in lib. 1. & proœm. in lib. 3. Comment. in Hierom.

All Ancient Writers style him a *Briton*, and *Dempster* himself (using the word improperly) calls him *English*. As for the present *Scotland*, *Garner* and they that take this from him, ought, if they compare the time in which *Pelagius* liv'd, to remember that at that time that Country was as fruitful of Authors, as *Lapland* or *Greenland* is now.

Year after the Apostles 310.

§. 4. *Pelagius* had written some Learned Works, as *three Books of the Trinity, &c.* before (10) he fell into those new Opinions against original Sin, and against the necessity of God's Grace for our doing Good Works; which were the two chief of the Heterodox Tenets held by him. And when he had in his own Breast entertain'd 'em, he at first exprest 'em slily in discourse among the People, or wrote 'em as the (11) Objections of other Men (much after the rate as Bishop *Taylor* of late days wrote his Arguments for Antipædobaptism) as if it were only for Disputation sake. These his Discourses were remembred and more minded afterwards.

(10) Gennad. de Scriptoribus, c. 42.

(11) August. de peccato orig. c. 21.

So for example, before he declar'd himself he wrote a short Exposition on St. *Paul's* Epistles; and in that to the *Romans* on *CH. V. v.* 12. he wrote thus, as St. *Austin* quotes his Words, (12)

*They that are against the derivation of Sin* [or, original Sin] *endeavour to disprove it thus,* 'If *Adam*'s Sin, '*say they*, hurts those that do not Sin themselves, then 'Christ's Righteousness may profit those that do not be'lieve; for, he says they are *as much, nay more, saved* '*by one, than they were before dead by one.*

(12) de peccator. meritis. l. 3. c. 2, 3.

*And then say they,* 'If Baptism does cleanse that old of'fence [or, take away original Sin] then they that are 'born of Parents both Baptized, must be without this 'Sin, for the Parents could not transmit that which they 'had not.

'This also, *say they*, may be added, If the Soul be not 'by propagation, but the flesh only, then that only has 'original Sin, and that only deserves Punishment: For it 'is unjust, *say they*, that a Soul created but to day, and 'that not out of the Mass of *Adam*, should bear the 'burden of another Person's Sin committed so long 'ago.

*They say also,* 'That it ought by no means to be 'granted, that God, who forgives us our own Sins, should 'impute to us other Peoples.

Then St. *Austin* adds, *You see* Pelagius *put all this into his Writings, not in his own Name, but in the Name of Others; being so satisfied that this was a Novelty, which but now began to make a noise against the old and settled Opinion of the Church, that he was asham'd or afraid to own it himself. And perhaps he is not of that Opinion himself, that a Person is born without Sin, to whom he confesses*

*confesses Baptism (in which remission of Sins is granted) to be necessary.* And a little after having shewn how contrary this Opinion is to Scripture, he says, *I believe a Man that is so excellent a Christian, does not at all hold these and the other absurdities that are so perverse and contrary to Christian truth.* Year after the Apostles 310.

This St. *Austin* says in a Book Written *Anno Domini* 412, several years after *Pelagius* had wrote his *Exposition on the Epistles.* So that he had not even then absolutely declar'd himself, at least St. *Austin* did not know that he had: But afterward, as St. *Austin* says in a later Book, (13) *being become a Heretick he maintained these same things with a most resolute obstinacy.* 312. (13) Retractat. l. 2. c. 33.

§. 5. *Anno Dom.* 410 *Rome* was taken and sack'd by the *Goths.* Then, or quickly after, *Pelagius* and *Celestius,* who during their living there had privately sowed the seeds of this Heresie, departed from thence. They are found to have been both in *Africa* in the year 411. *Pelagius* went (14) quickly from thence into the East Countries. *Celestius* staid there, and attempted to take Priests Orders in the Church of *Carthage*; but some of the Clergy of that Church having heard something of his Tenets, insisted, that he should be first examined about them. So at an Assembly or Council held there *Anno* 412, he was challeng'd by *Paulinus,* a Deacon of that Church, as having maintained several false Doctrines; and among the rest, these four, 310. 311. (14) Aug. de Gestis Palæstin. c. 22. 312.

1. *That* Adam *was created mortal, and that whether he had sinn'd or not, he would have died.*

2. *That the Sin of* Adam *hurt himself only, and not Mankind.*

3. *That Infants new born are in the same state that* Adam *was before his Fall.*

4. *That a Man may be without Sin, and keep the Commandments of God easily, if he will.*

I had occasion to set down the Acts of the Council, which contain the Accusations and his Answers to them, above in *CH.* 5. §. 8. If the Reader turn back thither, he will see the Substance of 'em to be, that he would not own original Sin, though he did not then absolutely deny it; but Infant Baptism he confesses to be necessary, and that he had never held otherwise,

Year after the Apostles 310.

316.

He also then put in his Plea in Writing (a *Libellus*, St. *Austin* calls it, or Confession of his Belief) in which he confessed, *That Infants have* Redemption *by the Baptism of Christ* (as the Bishops in a Council, that was held there five years after, do mention in their Letter (15) to *Innocent.*) From which Concession St. *Austin*, (who was not at that Council) afterward argued, (16) *By that word*, Redemption, *he has stopt up his way* [for any farther denial of original Sin,] *For from what are they* redeem'd, *but from the power of Satan?* &c.

(15) Epist. Synodic. Concilii Carthag. ad Innocent. apud Augustin. Ep. (90.

(16) Ep. 89. ad Hilarium.

The issue of the Council was, *Celestius* was refus'd, and all that held such Opinions Condemn'd. And he went from *Carthage*, saying, that he would refer himself to *Innocent*, Bishop of *Rome*; which he never found it for his purpose to do.

312.

§. 6. About this time, *Anno* 412. St. *Austin* wrote his first Treatise against those that held these Opinions (who were afterward called *Pelagians*; as yet *Pelagius* himself, tho' he had set 'em on foot, did not declare himself: And when St. *Austin* mentions him in this Book, 'tis with respect, and hoping he would not maintain 'em.) They were much talk'd of at *Carthage*, where *Pelagius* and *Celestius* had been; and *Marcellinus* a Nobleman living at that City, sent to St. *Austin* to desire his Resolution of the difficulties rais'd about 'em. It was in answer to that desire that he wrote two Books, and a little after a third Book (or Epistle) entituled, *Of the guilt and forgiveness of Sins, and of the Baptism of Infants.* The scope of 'em is to prove the Doctrine of Original Sin to be true, and that chiefly from the Baptism of Infants; and to assert the necessity of God's Grace, and to Answer the Objections.

In the first, he discourses of the state of *Adam* before and after his Fall, shews that his seed do derive Sin from him, not by imitation only (as these Men explain'd the Scripture sayings) but by propagation; that this propagated Corruption is in all Persons, even in Infants that have no actual Sin.

He proves this, first by Texts of Scripture, then by other Arguments; and, among the rest, by this, that Infants are by all Christians acknowledged to stand in need of Baptism, which must be in them for original Sin, since they have no other. He mentions and replies to some answers which the deniers of original Sin gave to this last Argument, which prest them very hard.

1. Some

1. Some said, (17) That Infants have actual Sin, meaning their peevishness, *&c.* and that they may have need to be Baptiz'd for that. These Men he judges unworthy of any answer here, as arguing against plain Sense; yet at the end of the Book he spends some time in answering 'em.

Year after the Apostles 310.

(17) Cap. 17.

§. 7. 2. Some said (18) They are Baptiz'd, not for *forgiveness of Sin*, but that they may be made *Heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven.* It is to be noted, the *Pelagians* held a middle state between Heaven and Hell. *These Men*, says St. *Austin, if they be ask'd whether Infants, not Baptized, and not made Heirs of the Kingdom, have yet the benefit of eternal Salvation at the Resurrection of the dead,* laborant vehementer, nec exitum inveniunt, *are at a great plunge, and can find no way out of it? Quis enim Christianorum ferat, cùm dicitur ad æternam salutem posse quenquam pervenire, si non renascatur in Christo, quod per baptismum fieri voluit?* &c: 'For what Christian Man can endure to hear it said, That any Person 'may come to eternal Salvation, that is not regenerated in Christ, which he has order'd to be done by Baptism? *&c.*

(18) Cap. 18.

And whereas these Men distinguish'd between Salvation and the Kingdom of Heaven, and said, Children might be *saved* without Baptism, tho' not come to the *Kingdom of Heaven*: He brings in that Text, *Tit.* 3. 5. *He* saved *us by the washing of Regeneration*, &c. As he does in a following Chapter, that of St. *Peter*, 1. *Ep.* 3. 21. *Baptism doth save us*: He proceeds, *Who dares to affirm that Infants may be saved without that Regeneration, as if Christ had not died for them? For Christ died for Sinners, and if these, who, 'tis plain, have committed no Sin in their own life, are not held captive under the* original *bond of Sin neither; How did Christ, who died for Sinners, die for them? If they are not diseased with any sickness of original Sin, why are they carried to Christ the Physician, to receive the Sacrament of their eternal Salvation, by the godly fear of their Friends that run with them to it? Why is it not said to them in the Church,* 'Carry back from 'hence these innocent Creatures, the whole have no need 'of a Physician, but they that are sick; Christ came not 'to call the Righteous, but Sinners? *Nunquam dictum est, nunquam dicitur, nunquam omnino dicetur in Ecclesiâ Christi tale commentum.* 'So odd a thing never was said, never

Year after the Apostles 310.

'never is said, nor ever will be [illegible] in the Church of 'Christ.

Concerning what was then said, or what [illegible] ever been said, St. *Austin* was a proper Judge; but we find now, that for what would be said in after times, he did not guess altogether right, if he meant that no Christians would ever say so.

(19) Cap. 19. Then (19) he Answers the Objections of those who said, If Infants were Sinners it were needful for them to repent, which since they cannot do, it is a sign that Baptism is not in their case used for forgiveness of Sin. His answer is, *That in like manner as they profess Faith by the words of those that bring 'em, they do also go for Penitents, when by the words of the same bearers they do* renounce the Devil and the World.

(20) Cap. 21. Whereas they objected, (20) If all Infants are Sinful, what Justice is it that some should happen to have Baptism, and so be forgiven; and others no more Sinful than they, should miss it, and so be condemned? He desires them to answer first, If all Infants are Sinless, what Justice is it that some should happen to have Baptism, and so be admitted into *the Kingdom of Heaven*, and others as Sinless as they should miss it, and to be excluded? He teaches that all such things are to be referred to the unsearchable Wisdom of God.

(21) Cap. 22. §. 8. He refutes (21) those that knowing not what else to say, ventur'd upon the exploded opinion of *Plato* and *Origen*, that the Souls of Infants] have lived before in another State or World, and have sinned there; and so pleaded that possibly it is for those Sins that they are here Baptized. He stops their mouths with that Scripture, *Rom.* 9. 11. *The Children being not yet born, having done neither good nor evil*, &c. and with several other Arguments, but that one is enough.

(22) Cap. 25. Having occasionally said, (22) that Infants, till they are Baptiz'd, do *abide in darkness*, he recites an Objection of some, that all that are born are inlightned,

(23) John 1. 9. from that Text, (23) *That was the true light that lighteth every Man* [or Person] *that comes into the World*; whereupon he says, *If that be so, it is a strange thing that they being inlightned by the only Son, who was in the beginning with God, God the Word, should not be admitted into the Kingdom of God, nor be Heirs of God, nor joint Heirs with Christ. For that this is not granted them*

*but*

*but by Baptism, even they that are of this Opinion do confess.* Year after the Apostles 310.

§. 9. He cites abundance of places (24) of Scripture to shew that all that Christ came to save, as Mediator, are by the Scripture suppos'd to have been in a lost Condition: He came, he took flesh, he submitted himself to the form of a Servant, died, *&c.* that he might quicken those that were dead, save those that were lost, free those that were in slavery, redeem those that were in captivity, inlighten those that were in darkness, rescue those that were under the power of Satan, *&c.* From whence he says it follows, *That they do not belong to this dispensation of Christ, fulfilled by his humiliation, who have no need of Life, Salvation, Deliverance, Redemption,* &c. *And consequently Baptism is not necessary for those who have no need of the Benefit of Forgiveness and Reconciliation by the Mediator.* 'Porro, quia parvulos 'baptizandos esse concedunt, qui contra autoritatem 'universæ Ecclesiæ, proculdubio per Dominum & A-'postolos traditam, venire non possunt, &c. *Now then, since they grant that Infants must be baptiz'd, as not being able to oppose the Authority of the whole Church, which was doubtless deliver'd by our Lord and his Apostles; they must consequently grant, that they stand in need of the Benefits of the Mediator; that being offer'd by the Sacrament and by the Charity of the Faithful, and so being incorporated into Christ's Body, they may be reconciled to God; that in him they may be quickned, saved, delivered, redeemed, inlightned; From what, but from death, wickedness, guilt, slavery, and darkness of Sins? Which since they have committed none in their own Life at that Age, there remains* [nothing that they can be guilty of but] *original Sin.* (24) Cap. 26, 27.

§. 10. He disputes largely (25) against their Opinion of a middle State, proving, *That there is no Salvation but in the Kingdom of God;* ——— *nor any middle Place where any one can be, except with the Devil, who is not with Christ. Hence our Lord himself, that he might raze out of the Minds of mistaken Men any Opinion of I know not what middle State, which some Men go about to attribute to unbaptized Infants, as that they shall, being Sinless, be in eternal Life, but not being Baptiz'd, shall not be with Christ in his Kingdom, gave this definitive Sentence to stop their Mouths,* He that is not with me is against me. *Give us therefore an Infant: If he be with* (25) Cap. 28.

*Christ*

Year after the Apostles 310.

*Christ already, what is he Baptized for? But if, as the truth is, he be therefore Baptized, that he may be with Christ, then it is sure that before he is Baptized he is not with Christ.*

Tho' St. *Austin* here in the heat of this dispute do once use this Expression, of unbaptized Infants being with the Devil, since by the *Pelagians* Confession they are not with Christ; yet he means but a very moderate degree of Condemnation or Misery, not like that of Wicked Men; but such as may be preferable to no being at all, as I shall shew hereafter. (26)

(26) Pt. 2. CH. VI. §. 5.

He goes on (27) to prove his point from the Name or Title given by our Saviour to Baptism, *John* 3. 5. *Except one be* born again [or, regenerated] *&c.* He says; *These Men, if they were mov'd* [or, convinced] *by this Sentence, would determine that Infants are not to be baptiz'd at all.* And he argues, *Why born again, but to be renewed? Renewed from what, but from the old nature,* à vetustate? *From what old nature, but that wherein* our old nature is crucified with him that *the* (28) *body of Sin* might be destroyed?

(27) Cap. 30, 31, *&c.*

(28) Rom. 6. 6.

He confirms the same sense by the following parts of our Saviour's discourse with *Nicodemus*, (29) *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, i. e. as St. *Austin* takes it, is corrupt or sinful. *And that which is born of the spirit, is spirit*, i. e. is renewed or sanctified.

(29) John 3. 6.

§. 11. He takes notice, (30) that those particular Men at *Carthage*, of whom *Marcellinus* had wrote to him, did grant, *That in Baptism there is forgiveness of Sins given Infants; not that they have any original Sin, but they have sinned since they were born.* He takes notice how much these differ from the others, whom he had been hitherto refuting, and one of whose Books he had seen. *The one*, says he, *minding the Scriptures and the Authority of the whole Church, and the Form of the Sacrament it self, see well that Baptism in Infants is for remission of Sins; but cannot see, or will not own, that it is original Sin. The other, considering humane nature,* ——— *See well, as it is easie to do, that that Age cannot in its own Life have contracted any Sin; but rather than confess original Sin, say there is no Sin at all in Infants.* He bids these two Parties first agree among themselves; for if each grant to the other that which they urge of truth, they will both hold the whole truth.

(30) Cap. 34.

How-

However, he does condescend (31) for the sake of these latter, to shew at large how impossible it is for a new born Infant, that has no knowledge of Good or Evil, to be guilty of actual Sin. But it seems a flat and needless Discourse, because, as he there observes, *A Man is never more troubled to find what to say, than when the thing he would prove is of it self plainer than any thing he can say.*

Year after the Apostles 310.

(31) Cap. 35.

What we can observe out of these passages of the first Book (besides what has been observ'd before) is the Tenet of *Pelagius* and his Followers. They denied original Sin; the Catholicks, among other Arguments against them, urg'd this, That Infants have Sin, is prov'd from the need they have of Baptism; and other than original Sin they cannot have. The *Pelagians* did not pretend to deny the necessity of Infant Baptism, which had been highly for their purpose to do, if they had thought they could have justified such a denial. And when St. *Austin* mentions it as a practice of *the whole Church from the Apostle's time*, they do not deny it, but own it, as we shall see hereafter: Only they said, Baptism, in the case of an Infant, is not for *forgiveness of Sin* (tho' they were driven from this hold too afterward, as we shall see) but to procure the Child an *entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven.* For they held, that an Infant dying unbaptized, shall be rais'd again, and live eternally in a certain middle state, without Punishment, as having no Sin; but not enjoying the Kingdom of Heaven, as being not Baptized into Christ. But that a Baptized Infant shall go into the Kingdom of Heaven.

§. 12. As for that Plea, that Infants have actual Sin, and are Baptized for that; it was the Tenet only of some Ignorant Persons among them, whom *Marcellinus* had mentioned. *Pelagius* and *Celestius* did not stand to that; but they held for a while stiff in their refusal to own Baptism of Infants to be for forgiveness.

*Celestius* had, as I said before, used the word *Redemption* as apply'd to Infants by their Baptism. And the same thing St. *Austin* observes here, (32) *They grant Redemption to be necessary for them, as is contain'd in a very short Book of one of 'em, who yet would not plainly express there the forgiveness of any Sin.* And again, (33) *Tho' they have not been willing in their Writings plain-*

(32) Cap. 34.

(33) L. 2. Cap. 36.

*ly*

Year after the Apostles 310.

*ly to own forgiveness of Sins to be necessary for Infants, yet they have own'd Redemption to be needful for them.*

§. 13. The second Book of this Work is on another Subject, *viz.* St. *Austin's* Resolution of this Question, put to him by *Marcellinus, whether there is, or ever was, or ever will be any Man without Sin, beside our Saviour Christ.*

As the *Pelagians* denied the original Corruption of our Nature, so accordingly they magnified the present Freedom and Goodness of it; and some at this time went so far, or as St. *Austin* here expresses it, (34) *presum'd so much on the freedom of Man's will, as to be of Opinion, that we have no need to be assisted by God to avoid Sin, after he has once granted to our nature the power of Free-will.* In confuting this Opinion of theirs he has not much occasion to speak of Infant Baptism. So I shall pass it by, but the indignation to see the Ancient Fathers so misrepresented as they are by some Modern Writers (with what intent they do this God knows) forces me to give in short the substance of his answer to this question; that it may appear how falsly he and St. *Hierom* are charged to contradict one another in the substantial part of their answer.

(34) L. 2. c. 2.

St. *Austin* divides this question into four: (35)

(35) Cap. 6.

1. Whether the thing be possible, viz. for a Man to live without Sin?

To this he answers, *I shall confess it to be possible by the Grace of God, and the free will of Man,* explaining himself so, as that God can, if he please, give such a measure of Grace, as that a Man should ever choose and do what is best.

2. Whether this do ever come to pass?

(36) Cap. 7.

Answ. (36) *I do not believe there is any such thing; I rather believe the Scripture, which says,* 'Enter not into 'Judgment with thy Servant, for in thy sight shall no 'Man living be Justified. Here he produces many Texts proving all Men to be Sinners.

3. If it be possible so to be, and yet never be so; what is the reason?

(37) Cap. 17.

Answ. (37) *I might answer easily and truly that Because Men will not. But if I am ask'd, why they will not? There's a great deal to be said. Yet leaving room for a more diligent enquiry, I shall answer to this also in short. Men will not do what is good, either because they are not convinced that it is good, or because it does not please 'em.*

4. Whe-

4. Whether there be, or ever can be, a Man that has never had any Sin? Year after the Apostles 310.

He answers, No. (38) because, suppose any Man should by God's Grace arrive to that perfection as not to Sin any more; yet having been conceiv'd in Sin, it will be true of him that he had Sins before he was converted to that newness of Life. (38) Cap. 20.

He proves these his answers largely, and answers the objections raised from 1 *John* 5. 18. *He that is born of God sinneth not*; and from what is said of *Job*, and of *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth* being blameless, upright, *&c.*

And whereas this sort of Men did use to catch and baffle the People with such logical querks as these, *Si nolumus, non peccamus:* 'We do not Sin whether we will 'or no. And, *possibilia Deus mandata dedit, aut impossibilia, &c.* (39) 'The things that God has set us to 'do, are either possible things, or impossible. If possi-'ble, we may perform 'em if we will; if impossible, 'then we are in no Fault for not doing impossible 'things. From whence they concluded that it was certainly true, which they maintain'd, *That a Man may be without Sin, and keep God's Commandments easily, if he will.* (39) Hierom. l. 1. contra Pelagianos.

St. *Austin* answers thus, *They seem to themselves witty when they say (as if any of us did not know that) that* we do not Sin whether we will or no; *and*, that God would never command a Man that which is impossible to humane will. *But they do not see, that to overcome some things which are either corruptly desired or corruptly feared, there is occasion for the strong, and sometimes the utmost, effort of the will* [or, resolution] *which he foresaw we should not perfectly exert in all cases, who would have it truly foretold by the Prophet,* In thy sight shall no Man living be justified.

§. 14. I recite this to shew that the grounds on which St. *Austin* oppos'd this presumptuous Doctrine, are not different from those on which St. *Hierom* did; as the Author I spake of before (41) would make us believe. For the answer given by St. *Hierom* to the same Cavils, is this, He had recited the Objection about *possible* and *impossible*, he had shew'd that some Men that are commendable for one quality, are faulty for another; and that none is perfect in all. Then to the dilemma he answers, (42) *They are possible things which God has commanded, I own it; but even for these possible things we cannot every one* (41) §. 2. (42) Dial. 1.

of

Year after the Apostles 310.

*of us have all of 'em; and this, not by reason of the weakness* [or, inability] *of nature, that you may not rail; but because of the wearinesse of the Mind, which cannot have all vertues together and keep 'em always. And if you will reproach the Creator for that, because he has made you such a Creature as does flag, or grow weary: I'll tell you again, it will be a smarter reprehension of him if you find fault with him that he has not made you a God. But you will say,* If I cannot do it, I am in no Sin. *You are in a Sin. Why could not you do that which another could do? And again, he in Comparison of whom you are worse, will be a Sinner himself in Comparison of some other, or of you in some other quality.*

This is the saying of St. *Hierom*, which that Writer instances in (43) as contrary to St. *Austin*'s Doctrine, but proves it no other way than by shewing that *Pelagius* (whom he takes to be St. *Austin*) rails against it. The answers of the one and of the other of these Fathers are for substance the same, *viz.* That tho' it be, logically speaking, true; which the *Pelagians* urg'd, *That we may do all that we can do* (the denial of it being a contradiction) yet there is no Man living but at sometimes he is slothful or weary, or not so watchful against Sin and Passion, as he himself will confess afterward he might have been. And this comes upon a Man in spite of the firmest resolution he can have settled beforehand.

(43) Bibliotheque Univers. T. 8. pag. 219.

The same Author in the same Treatise represents the Tenets of *Pelagius* and St. *Austin* very partially; and after such a manner as if St. *Austin* had produced no other proof against *Pelagius* of the need we all stand in of God's assisting Grace in order to live well, than what was fetch'd from the Doctrine of absolute and particular predestination. *The difference then,* says he, (44) *between St.* Austin *and* Pelagius *in this matter was this, that the first believed that since the Sin of* Adam *his Posterity are so corrupted, that they are born with such dispositions to evil, as do necessarily carry them to Sin; that if God will bring any one to good, he must for every good action give him a Grace, which shall inevitably make him will that which is good. And for the rest, those to whom he does not give such a Grace, are damn'd. God, by Wisdom, which we understand not, having a mind that Mankind should be born under an inevitable necessity of sinning, and of being accordingly tormented with eternal Punishments,*

(44) Bibl. T. 8. pag. 195.

*nishments, without delivering from this doleful necessity any more than a very small number of Persons to whom he gives an invincible Grace.* Year after the Apostles 310.

Now besides that the Opinion of St. *Austin*, concerning Predestination, is here very invidiously and disadvantageously represented, and that of *Pelagius* is as much smoothed over; What an unfair account is it of the Controversie between them, to make it turn upon that Point? St. *Austin* brought many other proofs and reasons in this Dispute, such as are own'd to be valid, not only by those that approve the Opinion he held about Predestination, but by those that dislike it. God forbid all should be *Pelagians* that have not the same Conceptions that St. *Austin* had about that other Matter; *Pelagianism* has been accounted an Heretical Doctrine in all Ages of the Church, and in all particular Churches, even in those in which the Doctrine of Predestination has been variously explain'd. 'Tis one thing thankfully to own the assistance of God's Spirit in all the good purposes and spiritual strength, we have; and another to determine that God limits this Grace and Assistance to a certain number of particular Persons, or gives it in an irresistible degree. Or, to speak plainly, there is a great difference between the *Arminian* and the *Pelagian* Tenets. Concerning the first, most Men are now agreed to bear with one another in any difference about 'em; but they that would obliterate the Doctrine of original Sin, and of the necessity of God's Grace, we know not whither they would lead us, nor what part of our Religion they will leave us.

The *Arminians* or *Remonstrants* did at the Synod of *Dort* exhibit an account of their Tenets in this Matter; wherein they frankly confess God's Grace to be necessary, not only as it illuminates our understanding, but also *voluntati vires confert ad non peccandum*, 'It gives 'strength to the Will to avoid Sin: And not only to teach us what we ought to do, but also *ut quod factu opus est, facere diligamus & valeamus*, 'That we may be able to 'do, and may love to do that which we ought; which was the thing required of *Pelagius* to confess, and on the owning whereof he would have been acquitted. They do also shew how far they differ from the *Pelagians* (and even from the *Semipelagians*) in all those other things for which either of the said Parties were Condemn'd by the Church of that time. This they do in the

Year after the Apoſtles 310.

(45) Declaration of their Tenet on the third and fourth of the five Articles. What then makes this Man (who profeſſes that way) to talk of *Pelagianiſm* as if it were ſo tack'd to *Arminianiſm*, that St. *Auſtin* could not confute the one without confuting the other? And to repreſent St. *Hierom*, who confuted *Pelagius*, without having recourſe to St. *Auſtin*'s Opinion of Predeſtination, as a (46) *Semipelagian*.

(45) Acta & Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Remonſtrantium, &c. Horderwici 1620. p. 23. &c.

(46) Bibl. T. 8. pag. 194.

§. 15. Whereas the chief Point on which *Pelagius* was Condemn'd, was his denial of any ſuch thing as an internal Grace of God's Spirit moving and inclining the heart to Faith, Love, Obedience, *&c.* which we ought to pray to God for: This Hiſtorian, citing *Petavius* for it, reckons up ſix ſorts of Grace which *Pelagius* owned. 1. God's Grace in giving us a Free Will: And, 2. In giving a Sinner pardon for Sins paſt to encourage him: And, 3. In giving his Law: And, 4. The Grace of Baptiſm, wherein an adult Perſon that has ſinned, obtains remiſſion of Sins, and the inheritance of God's Kingdom; an Infant has no remiſſion of Sins, as having no Sin in his Opinion, but yet is put into a better ſtate, being made an Heir of God's Kingdom: And, 5. In giving the Kingdom of Heaven as a reward to encourage us. Theſe five no body accus'd him of denying. But here (47) he is ſaid to have owned another ſort of Grace, *viz. The internal illumination of our Spirit, which* Pelagius *expreſſes in this wiſe.*

(47) Ibid. p. 198.

'I confeſs that Grace conſiſts not only in the Law, 'but in God's Aſſiſtance; for God aſſiſts us by his Do'ctrine and his Revelation, in opening the eyes of our 'hearts; in declaring to us the things that ſhall be here'after, that we may not be fix'd to the preſent things; 'in diſcovering to us the ſnares of the Devil; in in'lightning us by the manifold and unſpeakable gift of 'his Heavenly Grace. Does he that ſpeaks thus, think 'you, deny the Grace of God? Does he not confeſs 'at once both God's Grace and Man's Free-will?

'Tis true, St. *Auſtin* does quote theſe and other ſuch words out of *Pelagius*'s third Book of *Free-Will*. But he ſhews at the ſame place (48) that they are uſed by him only for a blind, and that his other ſayings in the ſame Book are ſuch as will not ſuffer theſe to be underſtood in a Catholick ſenſe. Both St. *Hierom* and St. *Auſtin* give this account of him (which they prove by ſeveral inſtances) that tho' he held thoſe ſingular Opinions, and

(48) de gratiâ Chriſti, l. 1. c. 7.

and propagated them privately in the minds of his Followers, yet he was very unwilling to be Convicted of so doing; and therefore us'd in his Writings a great deal of Equivocation. He would say such things as look'd like an owning of internal Grace; but still would take care to place his Words so as that he could, when occasion requir'd, explain 'em to mean only that Grace or Mercy of God, by which he gives us good Rules, Doctrines, Revelations, Promises, &c. And so here he limits (as St. *Austin* observes) all that he speaks of, *to Doctrine* and *Revelation*; and he does not name it *internal*, as Mr. *Le Clerc* does.

Year after the Apostles 310.

St. *Austin* shews him to have used the same Artifice thro' all his *four Books of Free Will*, which he wrote on purpose to vindicate his Reputation; and yet even there he never spoke home to the owning of God's Grace in the Catholick Sense, but often to the denying of it. He says there, in the same Book out of which the foresaid specious Words are quoted, (49) *We distinguish between these three things, and place 'em each in their due order; in the first place we rank*, posse, the power [of doing any thing;] *in the second* velle, the will to do it; *in the third* esse, the being of the thing. *We say the* power *is in our nature; the* will, *in arbitrio, in our choice; the* being *in the effect. The first*, i. e. the power *properly belongs to God, who has given it to his Creature; but the other two*, i. e. the will *and the* being *are to be referr'd to the Man, because they come from the Fountain of Free Will.*

(49) Pelagius de libero arbitrio, l. 3. apud August. de gratiâ Christi, l. 1. c. 4.

And in another place, (50) he says by way of Objection to his own Assertion,

(50) Ibid. c. 10.

Obj. *But how then shall that of the Apostle stand good,* (51) 'It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do?

(51) Phil. 3. 12.

Answ. *He worketh in us to will that which is good, to will that which is Holy, inasmuch as by the greatness of the future Glory, and his promise of Reward, he incourages us who are given to earthly desires, and do love only things before our eyes as brute Beasts; inasmuch as he raises our drowsie Will by the Revelation of his Wisdom; inasmuch as he advises us to every good thing*, &c.

All this S. *Austin* shews to be far short of what was necessary for him to say, if he would clear himself, because it makes God to work upon our Wills only outwardly by Proposals, and says, *Let him once at last own that Grace, by which the greatness of the future Glory is*

Year after the Apostles 310.

*not only promised to us, but believed and hoped for by us; and by which his Wisdom is not only revealed to us, but loved by us; and by which* non suadetur solùm omne quod bonum est, verùm & persuadetur, *we are not only advis'd to every good thing, but prevail'd on to follow it.* Then having Commented upon that Text, *No Man can come to me, except the Father who has sent me, draw him:* He adds, *This sort of Grace* Pelagius *ought to own, if he have a mind not only to be called, but to be, a Christian.*

But the Event proved, that he would never own that sort of Grace, and that the latent meaning of all his coloured Speeches was no other than what St. *Austin*, and his other Opponents took it to be. For when so much offence was taken at him, that nothing was to be expected but Excommunication, *Celestius* and he being then in the *East*, applied themselves to the Church of *Rome*, to see if the Apology they made for themselves would pass there. *Celestius* came in Person, and deliver'd in a *Confession of his Faith: Pelagius* came not, but sent one, of which I shall by and by give a Copy, and a Letter with it. There happen'd to be then a weak Bishop of that Church, *Zosimus*, who was for the present so far impos'd on by their pretences, and was so incompetent a Judge of this Question, and of the other about original Sin (as I shew more particularly (52) hereafter) that he took what they said for Orthodox, and blamed their Accusers as having slander'd 'em; tho' his Predecessor *Innocent* had declar'd an ill Opinion of 'em. But the *African* Bishops being then in Council at *Carthage*, sent their Synodical Epistle to *Zosimus*, advertizing him of the Craft and Equivocation used by those Men, and shewing by instances, wherein his Examination of 'em was short of what it ought to have been, and that *Celestius* ought particularly to recant the erroneous Positions in his *Confession*. Upon the coming of this Letter, when *Celestius* was summoned to appear, (53) *That by his direct and plain answer either his Hypocrisie, or else by his Amendment might be made manifest, and be no longer ambiguous; he withdrew himself, and would not come to the hearing.* So far St. *Austin*'s Words are; but *Mercator* gives this farther Circumstance, (54) That *he ran away from* Rome.

316.

(52) §. 33.

317.

(53) August. contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum. l. 2. c. 3.

(54) Commonitorium. c. 1.

This

This passage of the History Mr. *Le Clerc* leaves out, which none that pretended to write this History ever left out before; for it is a plain proof that the Opinion against the Grace of God, which the Catholicks charged the *Pelagians* with, was their real Opinion; and not wrongfully affixt on 'em by taking their words in a worse sense than they meant 'em, as he would have it believed. Year after the Apostles 310.

The issue was, the Bishops of *Africa* continued in their Resolution, and the next year sent a peremptory Letter to *Zosimus*, (who had done all he could to have these Men acquitted) that they did determine, *Constituimus, &c.* (55) *That the Sentence pronounc'd against* Pelagius *and* Celestius, *by the Reverend Bishop* Innocent, *from the See of the blessed Apostle* Peter, *do stand firm, so long till they do by a plain Confession own that we are in every action assisted by the Grace of God thro' our Lord Jesus Christ, not only to understand, but also to practice righteousness; in such wise as that without it we are not able to do, to speak, to think, or to have any thing of true and sincere Piety.* And *Zosimus* at last complied with them, and joined in giving the same Sentence: And so, as *Prosper* tells us, (56) did all the World. 318. (55) Prosper contra Collat. c. 10. (56) Chronic. ad ann. 418.

They were, as appears by St. *Austin*'s words, (57) *Either to do Penance* [*viz.* recant their Heretical Opinions, whereof this of denying God's Grace, and the other of original Sin were the chief] *or, if they refused that, to stand Condemn'd* [or, Excommunicated.] There were also Imperial Edicts against them. (57) De peccato originali, c. 22.

§. 16. All that we hear of afterwards, that tended toward Recantation, was this, *Pinianus* and *Albina* and *Melania* being then in the *East*, where *Pelagius* was, wrote to St. *Austin*, that they *had dealt with him* (58) *to condemn* [or recant] *under his hand, all the things that were objected to him; and that* [as to God's Grace] *he had said in their hearing, thus*, 'I do anathematize [or, renounce] 'any one that says or thinks that the Grace of God, 'by which Christ came into the World to save Sinners, 'is not necessary both every hour and moment, and 'also in every action; and they that take away [or deny] 'this Grace, are to have [or, may they have] eternal pu'nishment. 319. (58) Austin. de gratiâ Christi. c. 2.

Year after the Apostles 310. But St. *Austin* in answer (59) shews them, that these Words are capable of the same Equivocation he was wont to use; that probably by *the Grace of God by which Christ came to save Sinners*, he meant nothing but the *pardon of Sins*, or, the *example of Christ*, the consideration of which was always necessary; that he had before in 315. the Synod of *Diospolis* said as much as this comes to: For that being there accus'd of holding, *That the Grace of God is not given in every action, but does consist in our Free Will, or in the Law and Doctrine*; and, *that the Grace of God is given according to our deserts*: And the proof brought against him being this, that *Celestius*, who was his Disciple, had written such things: He answer'd, *Whether these are* Celestius's *sayings or not, let them look to it that say they are his. I never held so, and I do anathematize any one that holds so.* And yet that after that, he had in his *Books of Free-Will* shewn that he *had really no other Sentiments than such as he seemed then to condemn.*

(59) Ibid. c. 3.

So this did not avail him. He knew well enough what words to have express'd himself in, so as to satisfie the Church; but he would not use 'em. St. *Austin* told him (60) that *inasmuch as the question about reconciling Man's Free-Will, and God's Grace, is so intricate, that while one is asserted, the other may seem to be denied, if he would grant that God does not only give us a power of doing well, but does also assist us in the willing and doing of it* (which, by the way, is what I shewed before that the *Remonstrants* do, or at least did, freely own) *the Controversie would be at an end.*

(60) Ibid. c. 4.

But he would never say so. He continued Excommunicate, and seems to have liv'd obscurely all the rest of his time.

After all, it is not material to us, whether he was guilty, or whether his Accusers were mistaken in his sense (it were to be wish'd he could have been shewn to have been guiltless) were it not that some now adays, that have a mind to set up the same Opinions to a much worse purpose than ever *Pelagius* did, do go about to retrieve the credit of 'em by discrediting the Catholick Church of that time.

That which St. *Austin* says to *Pelagius*, on his account of denying God's Grace, may be applied to some of them on account (not only of that, but also) of an Article of a higher nature, which they are supposed likewise

wise not to believe. (61) *He has not thought fit any where to own that we, when we pray, are assisted by God's Grace that we may not Sin; and if he does, notwithstanding in his own mind believe this, he must pardon those that suspect otherwise: For he himself causes this suspicion, who, when he lies under so much obloquy on that account, will believe this, and yet will not confess it. What great matter were it for him to say this, especially where he undertakes to handle and explain that point,* &c? *Why should he there defend nature only,* &c?

Year after the Apostles 310.

(61) Augustin. de naturâ & gratiâ. c. 59.

§. 17. I have recited what I mean to do of the dispute concerning God's Grace altogether, that it may give no interruption to what remains to be said of the other concerning original Sin, and the occasions thence taken to speak of Infant Baptism.

In the third of those Books, *Of the guilt and forgiveness of Sins, and Baptism of Infants*, St. *Austin* having in the foregoing Chapters recited several Interpretations, of which those Texts, *Rom.* 5. 12, 13, 14, &c. are capable, concludes in the fifth Chapter, that which soever of them be taken, the Words *can have no other sense but such an one by which it has come to pass that the whole Church has from of old constantly held that Fidel* [or, baptized] *Infants do obtain remission of original Sin by the Baptism of Christ.*

Then he recites a large piece of the Epistle of St. *Cyprian* to *Fidus*, which I gave a Copy of in *CH. VI.* and observes how he there takes the Doctrine of original Sin in Infants, for a known and undoubted thing; and by it proves (what was then by *Fidus* question'd) that an Infant may and must be Baptized before the 8th day, if need require. Then (62) he adds,

(62) Cap. 6.

*And now some People by the boldness of I know not what disputing humour, go about to represent that as uncertain which our Ancestors made use of as a most certain thing whereby to resolve some things that seemed uncertain. For, when this began first to be disputed, I know not; but this I know, that holy* Hierom, *whose pains and fame for excellent Learning in Ecclesiastical Matters, is at this day so great, does also make use of this as a thing most certain, to resolve some questions in his Books,* &c. Then having quoted some passages out St. *Hierom* on *Jonah*, he proceeds, *If we could with convenience come to ask that most Learned Man; how many Writers of Christian Dissertations and Interpreters of Holy Scripture in both Languages could he*

Year after the Apostles 300.

*recount, who from the time that Christ's Church has been founded, have held no otherwise, have received no other Doctrine from their Predecessors, nor left any other to their Successors? For my part (tho' my reading is much less than his) I do not remember that I ever heard any other thing from any Christians that received the old and new Testament,* Non solùm in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ, verum etiam in quâlibet hæresi vel Schismate constitutis: *Neither from such as were of the Catholick Church, nor from such as belonged to any Sect or Schism.* Non memini me aliud legisse, &c. *I do not remember that I ever read otherwise in any Writer that I could ever find treating of these matters, that followed the Canonical Scriptures, or did mean or did pretend to do so. From whence it is that this trouble is started up upon us I know not; but a little while ago when I was there at* Carthage, *I just cursorily heard some transient discourse of some People that were talking that Infants are not Baptized for that reason that they may receive remission of Sins, but that they may be sanctified in Christ. Tho' I was something startled at the Novelty, yet because it was not seasonable then to enter into any Discourse against it, and because they were not Persons of any such rank as to be much taken notice of, it past over with me as a thing forgotten, or not minded. And lo, now it is a thing maintain'd against the Church with ardent endeavours; it is even by Writing transmitted to Memory; it is come to that difficulty that the Brethren are fain to ask our Opinions of the matter; and we find a necessity of disputing and Writing against it.*

This Testimony of St. *Austin* must needs be look'd on as a very considerable evidence. He declares, he never met with any Christian, either Churchman or Sectary; nor with any Writer that owned the Scripture, who taught any other Doctrine, but that Infants are Baptiz'd *for pardon of Sin.* Much less then had he known or heard of any that denied that they are to be Baptiz'd at all. And they had then, as I observ'd before, but 300 years to look back to the times of the Apostles. And St. *Austin*, tho' he speak modestly of himself as to Learning, had studied the Church History so well, that in a few years after this he publish'd that his *History of all the Sects or Opinions* that were, or had been in Christendom; out of which I quote some things in another Chapter. (63)

(62) CH. XXI.

§. 18.

§. 18. To that Objection of *Pelagius, If Baptism do take away original Sin, then such Children as are born of Parents both Baptiz'd must be without that Sin.* St. *Austin* answers to this purpose, (64) That an error is often strengthened by putting alien and intricate questions about the matter, which is an easie thing in most matters to do. *Yet,* says he, *If I had this cause to manage against such Men as did either deny that Infants are to be Baptiz'd, or did say that it is needless to Baptize 'em, for that they being born of Fidel* [or, Baptized] *Persons, were necessarily partakers of their Parents privilege; then I ought to take more pains in confuting this Opinion.* Such Persons (as he shews at large) would have need to be put in mind, that as a Circumcised Parent begets an Uncircumcised Son, and Wheat that has been cleansed from the Chaff does, if it be sowed, produce Wheat with Chaff on it: So a Parent that has been spiritually cleansed begets a Son that resembles him not according to that state that he is in by spiritual Regeneration, but according to the state he was in by carnal Generation.

Year after the Apostles 310.

(64) Cap. 8.

*But now,* says he, (65) *since we have to do with such as do confess that the Children of Baptized Persons, are to be Baptized, how much better is it to say thus to 'em, You that do affirm* that of Parents cleansed from the stain of Sin, such Children should be born as are without Sin, *How is it that you do not mind that at the same rate you might say, that* of Christian Parents there should be born Christian Children? *And then why do you determine that they are to be Baptiz'd?*

(65) Cap. 9.

§. 19. And having afterward (66) on this occasion mention'd that Text, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Now are your Children Holy,* &c. he refers to the Exposition of it which *Pelagius* had given, and the like to which he himself had given in a former Treatise (67) which I recited before (68) and says, that it must be understood so, or else in another sense which he there gives (relating to the forbearance of the use of the Marriage Bed during the Woman's Uncleanness,) or else in some other sense of which we may not be certain. And then adds,

(66) Cap. 12.

(67) De consensu Evangelist.

(68) CH. XV. Sect. 2.

*Illud tamen sine dubitatione tenendum est, quæcunque illa sanctificatio sit, non valere ad Christianos faciendos atque ad dimittenda peccata, nisi Christianâ & Ecclesiasticâ institutione & sacramentis efficiantur fideles. Nam nec, &c.*

But

Year after the Apostles 310.

'But that is to be held without any doubt, that 'whatever that Holiness [*or, Sanctification*] be, it is not 'available to the making of 'em Christians, or to the par-'don of Sins, unless they be made Fidels by the insti-'tution [*or, order*] of Christ and the Church, and by 'the Sacraments. For neither are unbelieving Husbands 'or Wives, how holy and just partners soever they 'have, cleansed from the iniquity which keeps 'em from 'the Kingdom of God, and brings 'em to Damnation; 'nor are Infants, of how holy and just Parents soever 'they come, pardon'd the guilt of original Sin; un-'less they (*i. e. the one and the other*) be Baptized in Christ.

One may here in short confer together the several Comments of the Ancients on this Text, *The unbelieving Husband is sanctified* [or, an unbelieving Husband has been sanctified] *by his Wife*, &c. *Else were your Children unclean; but now they are holy.* They do, most of 'em, and those the most Ancient make that holiness of the Children relate to their Baptism, as given, or to be given before they are actually holy.

296. (69) De consensu Evang. lib. 2.

1. St. *Austin* in a former Book (69) interprets *has been sanctified*, i. e. *has been brought to the Faith.* And, *Now are your Children holy*, i. e. *Now are they baptized.* And he there gives the grounds of that Interpretation; as may be seen by turning back to the place where I recited it (70). And here he says again, it must be interpreted so, or else certainly in some such sense as does not make them holy so as to inherit the Kingdom, unless they be Baptized.

(70) CH. XV. Sect. 2.

299.

2. He also here recites the Explication that *Pelagius* had given of this Text, and says, Pelagius, *when he wrote on this Epistle, expounded it thus*, "Exempla jam præcesserant & virorum quos uxores & fœminarum quas "mariti lucrifecerant Christo, & parvulorum ad quos fa-"ciendos Christianos voluntas Christiana etiam unius "parentis evicerat. 'There were, by this time exam-'ples, both of Men whom their Wives, and of Women 'whom their Husbands had gained over to Christ; and 'of Infants, concerning whom the Christian desire even of 'one of their Parents had prevailed that they should be 'made Christians.

He

He manifestly Paraphrases these Words [*now are they holy*] thus, *Now are they made Christians.* And, the unbelieving party *has been sanctified*, i. e. *has been gained over to Christ.* Year after the Apostles 310.

The very same Explication is, as they say, still extant at this Text, in those *Commentaries on St.* Paul's *Epistles* that go under the name of St. *Hierom*, but are *Pelagius*'s, only interpolated.

3. *Tertullian* speaking of the privilege that Infants have by being of Christian Parents, or of one Parent such, says, *Now are they holy*, i. e. *designed for holiness*; *for otherwise, the Apostle knew what our Lord had determined*, 'Except one be born of Water and the Spirit, he shall not 'enter into the Kingdom of God, *that is, he shall not be holy.* See the place at large *CH. IV.* §. 6. 100.

Appendix

4. *Paulinus* writes to St. *Hierom* this question, *How are they holy, whenas without the gift of Grace* [*viz.* Baptism] *given them afterward* [after their Birth] *and preserved, they cannot be saved?* (71) 293.

5. St. *Hierom* for answer refers him to the forementioned resolution of *Tertullian*, but withal mentions some other Interpretations about legal cleanness or uncleanness. (71) See CH. XVIII.

And the same Father in his Epistle to *Leta*, (72) a Christian Woman Daughter of *Albinus* a Heathen, Priest of *Jupiter*, having mentioned this Text, says, it had been *verified in her Family*; for that she who had been born *de impari matrimonio of an unequal Marriage*, i. e. her Father a Heathen, but her Mother being a Christian, *The sweetness of the Fruit had recompensed for the bitterness of the Root; and an ill Shrub had sweat forth precious Balsam*, &c. *We have born* [or, waited] *to good purpose. A Holy and Christian Family does Sanctifie one Unbeliever. He* [*Albinus* himself] *is now a Candidate of the Faith, since he is incompass'd with a multitude of his Children and Grandchildren that Believe. I fancie that* Jupiter *himself might have believed, if he had had such kindred.* Since he makes this to be a fulfilling of this Text, and the *Sanctifying of an Unbeliever* to be the Converting, or probability of Converting him, 'tis plain he understood it as those foregoing. All these bring the Baptism of Infants into the Explication of their Holiness. (72) Epist. 7.

6. St.

Year after the Apostles 310.

298.

(73) In loc.

6. St. *Chrysostom* says (73) a great deal of clean and unclean, without coming to any particular Explication of what he means by it. He says, *That the Woman might not fear being made unclean by the Copulation, the Apostle tells her,* 'The Unbelieving Husband is San-'ctified by the Wife, *&c.* And then having shewn why, tho' Adultery is a reasonable cause of Separation, yet Idolatry or Heathenism is not, he adds, *Then there is given a proof of this: For on supposition that thou being unclean didst bring forth a Child, and that Child being not from thee alone, the Child would be clean, or but half clean; and therefore he adds,* 'Else were your Chil-'dren Unclean, but now they are Holy, *i. e. Not unclean. But he uses the Word* Holy, *by an over reaching Expression, that he might farther dispel all Fear of any such suspicion, viz.* of Uncleanness.

This is something obscure; but he seems to make no more out of this Text than the Antipædobaptists do. Yet it is plain that he could not mean that by this cleanness the Children would obtain Salvation, without Baptism; because he so often and so plainly affirms the contrary, as I have shewed in CHAP. XIV. §. 2.

(74) In loc.

7. He that made the Commentaries ascribed to St. *Ambrose*, talks yet more slightly; he says, (74) *If the believing party stay with the other, the sign of the Cross will be us'd in the House; and that is a Sanctification of it:* And that, *if the believing Party go away, and lie with others, it would be Adultery; and the Children so begotten would be unclean, because they would be Bastards.* He makes St. *Paul's* arguing to come to no more than this, Let the believing Woman stay and sanctifie the House and her unbelieving Husband with the sign of the Cross; for if she go from him and lie with others, the Children so begotten would be Bastards. Who doubts it?

I know not at what year to place this Author, for these Commentaries are pieced out of several Authors, some elder, some later. This I believe was a later one.

323.

(75) In loc.

8. *Theodoret* (75) explains, *The unbelieving party is sanctified, that is, there is hopes of their Salvation. But, suppose either the Man or the Woman do persist in unbelief; yet the seed shall be saved.* These last Words he explains as *Calvin* has since done.

9. He

9. He that wrote the *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, that are among the Works of *Athanasius*, explains *holy* by *shall be saved*. But he limits it expresly to such as are Baptized. I give his Words among the spurious pieces, CH. XXIII. Year after the Apostles 310.

These are all the Interpretations of this Text, that I know of, given by the Ancients.

St. *Austin* in this Book (76) answers one more Objection of *Pelagius*, which is this, If the Soul be not deriv'd from the Parents, but the Body only; how comes the Soul to be involv'd in the guilt of original Sin? (76) Cap. 10.

He answers, 1. That *Pelagius* had spoke like a circumspect Man when he put that with an *if*; for that it is an obscure Matter, and not to be resolv'd from Scripture, whether the Soul be deriv'd, or be immediately created. And, 2. He bids him answer this question first; *If the Soul be not deriv'd, what Justice is it that a Soul newly created, and void of all Guilt, wholly free from all Contagion of Sin, should in Infants suffer several passions and torturings of the Body, and which is more dreadful, the outrage of evil Spirits?* He advises, that since we see this by Experience to be so, and yet cannot answer for the reason or justice of it, we should in all such questions remember that we are but Men.

Having made so large an abstract of what St. *Austin* says of this matter in these three Books, which were his first work against the *Pelagians*, I may have liberty to pass by a great many sayings in his following Books against them. For it were endless to recite all the passages which we meet with in them speaking of Infant Baptism, and proving from it original Sin. I shall therefore mention only here, and there one, and that only in *English* for brevity.

§. 20. The next year, *Anno* 413. St. *Hierom* wrote his Epistle to *Ctesiphon* (77) against that Opinion of the *Pelagians*, which denies the need we have of God's Grace, wherein he mentions not *Pelagius* by name, but means him when he says, *Speak out that which you hold: Declare publickly what you talk in private to your Disciples. ——— This is the only Heresie that is asham'd to speak openly what it teaches privately. The forwardness of the Disciples publishes that which the Masters keep in. What they hear in the Chambers, they proclaim on the House top.* He instances in some passages of a Book publish'd by one of the Disciples; (77) Epist. 120.

Year after the Apostles 310.

ſciples; which was probably *Celeſtius*; for *Pelagius* being of more refined Politicks, generally forbore to appear himſelf, and put this *Iriſhman* foremoſt. They called the Book *Syllogiſms*; but St. *Hierom* ſays it ought to be called *Soleciſms*. It had in it ſuch ſayings as theſe,

*'Tis in vain that God has given me the power of Free Will, if I can't put it in practice without his continual help.*

*I do either uſe the power once given me, ſo as that Free Will is preſerv'd: Or elſe, if I ſtand in need of another's help, the Freedom of will is deſtroyed in me.*

*If I have a mind to bend my finger, ſtir my hand, ſit, ſtand, walk, run, ſpit, blow my noſe, eaſe my ſelf, make water: What! ſhall the help of God be always neceſſary for me?*

This St. *Hierom* calls Blaſphemy and Sacrilege, and ſays,

*What venom of Hereticks does not this ſurpaſs? They maintain that by reaſon of the Freedom of their will they have no farther need of God.*

He has nothing here of original Sin, and ſo not of Infants. He promis'd a larger Work, in which he would refute all their errors, which he performed two years after.

314.

The next year St. *Auſtin* wrote a large and elaborate Letter in anſwer to one he had received out of *Sicily* from *Hilarius*. It is to be noted that *Celeſtius*, after his being Condemn'd in *Africa*, or elſe in going from *Rome* to *Africa*, had made his abode for ſome time in *Sicily*; and had, as it ſeems, ſowed the ſeeds of his Hereſie there. For *Hilarius* deſired St. *Auſtin*'s Judgment concerning *ſome new Doctrines, which*, ſays he, (78) *ſome Chriſtians at* Syracuſe *do publiſh.*

(78) Inter Epiſtolas Auguſtini Ep. 88.

1. *That a Man may be without Sin, and keep God's Commandments eaſily, if he will.*
2. *That an unbaptized Infant ſurprized with Death cannot periſh deſervedly, becauſe he is born without Sin.*
3. *That a rich Man, if he keep his Wealth and do not ſell all that he has, cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. And that it will not avail him that he uſes his riches well* [or, according to the Commandments.]

4. *That*

4. *That one must not swear at all.*
5. *Whether the Church, of which it is written,* not having spot or wrinkle, *be that in which we now live, or that which we hope for. For some think it is this Church which consists of present Persons,* &c.

Year after the Apostles 310.

To the second of these St. *Austin* (79) answers,

(79) Epist. 89.

*Whereas they say,* An unbaptized Infant cannot perish because he is born without Sin. *The Apostle does not say so, and I suppose it is better to believe the Apostle than them. For that Teacher of the* Gentiles, *in whom Christ speaks,* says, (80) By one Man Sin enter'd into the World, &c, For Judgment was by one offence *to Condemnation*; but the Grace is of many offences to Justification. *Therefore if they can find any Infant that is not sprung from the Concupiscence of that one Man; of such an one let 'em say, that he is not liable to that Condemnation, nor needs by the Grace of Christ to be deliver'd from it.*

(80) Rom. 5. 12, &c.

*What mean's*; By one offence to Condemnation, *but, by that one offence in which* Adam *offended*? *And what means*; Of many Offences to Justification, *but, that the Grace of Christ does take off not only that Offence with which Infants, sprung from that one Man, are held bound; but also the many offences which when they are grown Men, they add to it by wicked practices? But still that one, to which the carnal off-spring that derives from that first Man is liable, is, he says, enough for their* Condemnation. *Therefore the Baptism of Infants is no more than what is necessary that they, who by their Generation are subject to that Condemnation, may by Regeneration be freed from it. And as there is not a Person in the World who is carnally generated but from* Adam, *so neither is any spiritually Regenerated but by Christ. The carnal Generation is liable to that one offence, and the Condemnation thereof; but the spiritual Regeneration takes away not only that one for which Infants are Baptized; but also those many which Men by wicked living have added to that in which they are generated.*

*And therefore he goes on, and says,* 'If by one Man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive the abundance of Grace shall reign, &c. Therefore, as by the offence of one Judgment came on all Men to *Condemnation*, so by the Righteousness of one the free gift came on all Men to *Justification* of Life; for as by one Man's disobedience many were made Sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.

*What*

Year after the Apostles 310.

*What will they say to this? Or what is possible for 'em to say, unless they will plead that the Apostle is mistaken? That chosen vessel, the Teacher of the Gentiles, that Trumpet of Christ, proclaims,* Judgment came by one to Condemnation; *and these proclaim on the contrary, and say, That Infants, who, as they confess, derive from that one Man of whom he speaks, do not go into Condemnation tho' they be not Baptiz'd.*

Judgment, *says he*, came by *one* to Condemnation. *By one, what does he mean, but by* one *offence? Since it follows,* but the Grace is of many *offences* to Justification.

Then he answers to that Plea of theirs, by which they said that St. *Paul* by *one offence* meant both the Sin of *Adam*, and also all the Sins which Men by imitating that, do commit.

He shews, that if St. *Paul* had meant so, he would have said in like manner of the Grace of Christ, that that was of *one* offence to Justification; but he distinguishes, and says, Condemnation came by *one* offence; but the Grace of Christ justifies from *many* offences.

Afterwards he says, *If, as they pretend, the Apostle had said these things on this account, that we should understand Sinners to belong to that first Man, not that we derive Sin by being born of him, but by imitating him: he would rather have named the Devil; for he sinned first, and from him Mankind do not derive their Pedigree, but only they imitate him.——— And if it were on account of imitation that the Apostle named the first Man; because he was the first Sinner among Men, and for that reason all sinful Men were said to belong to him: Why did he not name* Abel *as the second Man, who was the first Righteous among Men?——— But he names* Adam, *and on the other part names none but* Christ. *Because as the one, a Man, did by his Sin defile his Posterity, so the other, God and Man, did by his Righteousness save his inheritance; the one by transferring* [or, conveying] *the defilement of the flesh, which the Devil, tho wicked, could not; the other by giving the Grace of his Spirit, which* Abel, *tho' righteous could not.*

He at last observes to *Hilarius*, that *Celestius* had been Condemn'd for this Doctrine at *Carthage* two years before, and tells him that he himself had publish'd some Books, and had preach'd ostentimes against it, and had recover'd several: That there were still some at *Carthage* that held that Opinion, but privately; that in many places

places there were more of them than one would expect, *And where they are not refuted, they seduce others to their Sect, and are grown so numerous that I know not what it will come to. But we wish rather that they should be healed in the unity of the Church, than that they should be cut off from the Body of it as incurable Members; provided necessity do not compel it. For there is some fear lest more limbs do putrifie, whilst the putrified ones are spared,* &c.

Year after the Apostles 310.

§. 21. The third and fourth Positions of the *Pelagians*, about a rich Man, and about swearing, are such as may possibly raise the Reader's Curiosity to know what was said to those questions in these times.

To the third St. *Austin* observes that *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob* were rich, and continued so, and yet have a place in the Kingdom. That the rich Man in the Parable did not go into torment because he died rich, but because he was Luxurious, and Unmerciful to *Lazarus*; that *Lazarus*, when he died, was carried into the Bosom of a rich Man, *&c.*

And whereas the *Pelagians* pretended that the selling of all is necessary under the New Testament, tho' not under the Old; he observes that our Saviour, who set the rich young Man this condition of *being perfect*; *Sell that thou hast*, &c. yet did not set this as the condition of *entring into Life*; but that other (81) *Keep the Commandments.* That the Apostle teaching rich Men how *to lay hold* (82) *on eternal Life*, bids them *do good, distribute, communicate*, &c. but does not require 'em to sell all.

(81) Mat. 19. 17, 21.
(82) 1 Tim. 6. 17, 18, 19.

But to the Argument which they raised from these words of our Saviour, (83) *A rich man shall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, &c. St. *Austin* makes no answer what but seems defective. *How is it then*, says he, *does the Apostle speak contrary to the Lord? Or, do these Men not understand what they talk of?* He refers 'em to Christ's following words, *With Men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.* Those they explained thus, as he tells us, 'Christ knew that several rich Men, upon hearing the Gospel, would sell their Estates and give 'em to 'the Poor, *&c.* and so that would be done which seemed 'so difficult; not, that any of 'em continuing in their 'Wealth, would, by keeping those rules of the Apostle, 'lay hold on eternal Life; but that selling all that they 'had, they would so fulfil those rules of the Apostle.

(83) Mat. 19. 23, &c.

Year after the Apostles 310.

Here S. *Austin* observes that according to this their own Interpretation, *Our Lord does, contrary to their Tenet, set forth his own Grace; for he does not say*, 'That which seems 'to you impossible, is easie for Men to do, if they will. '*But he says*, 'That which is impossible with Men, is 'easie with God. And following on that point, he forgets to return and give any answer how he himself would have those words of our Saviour to be understood. Only he observes that the Apostle's words could not be so meant as they explain'd 'em, *viz.* of selling all they had, because he gives several rules how they should provide for their Servants, Children, *&c.* which is not consistent with selling all they had: *For*, as he observes, *How can this be done without a House, and something to keep it?*

Our Saviour seems in that saying, *A rich Man shall hardly enter into the Kingdom of God*, to have meant, as he does in many other Places, by the *Kingdom of Heaven*, and, the *Kingdom of God*, not the Kingdom of Glory; but the state of the profession of the Gospel and of Faith in him, as it was at that time, when both himself and all that would be his Disciples, were so persecuted that they could not think of keeping any estate if they had it. And as things so stood, it was very hard to perswade any rich Man to enter into it; so hard, that humanely speaking, it was impossible. Only God by the power of his Grace might overcome that love of their Wealth, which hindred them from owning Christ. Now that necessity is not at all times; but only in times of persecution.

If this be the sense, the Translation would be more intelligible if it were said, not *shall hardly*, but *will hardly enter*, &c.

And if this be the sense, then what St. *Austin* answers is pertinent and full, *viz.* that there are many rich Men, who, tho' they do not actually sell all, and give to the Poor, yet are ready to part with all, if occasion should be, for the sake of Christ and his truth; and who in the mean time do keep their Families in Christian Discipline, use Hospitality and Beneficence to the Poor, receive a righteous Man in the name of a righteous Man, *&c.* And he takes notice that *Pelagius* himself was relieved in his necessities by such rich Men, and entertain'd by 'em (and others speak of him as a great haunter of such Mens Houses) he says,

*These*

*These Men, if they expect to be such as the Apostle (84) speaks of,* 'That shall judge Angels, *ought to resolve before hand* to receive (85) into everlasting Habitations those that have made *them* their Friends with the Mammon of Unrighteousness. ——— *Those Servants of God, who having sold all, do afterwards live upon the honest labour of their own hands, may with much less impudence condemn Men from whom they receive nothing, than those that not being able by reason of some infirmity to work with their hands, do condemn the Men that maintain 'em.*

Year after the Apostles 310.

(84) 1 Cor. 6. 3.

(85) Luke 16. 9.

*I that write this, was greatly in love with that perfection of which our Lord spoke, when he said to the rich Man,* Go and sell all, *&c. and I did so; not by my own strength, but by his assisting Grace. And tho' I was not rich, there will never the less be imputed to me for that; for the Apostles themselves, that did this first, were no rich Men. But he parts with all the World, that parts with all that he has or hopes to have. ——— And I do my utmost endeavour to perswade others to this purpose, and I have in the name of God, several partners, who have by my ministery been brought to it. But still so as that the sound Doctrine is preserv'd among us, and that we do not in way of vain-glory censure those that do not take the same course, and tell 'em that it will not avail 'em to live chastly in Matrimony, to order their Houses and Families Christian like,* &c.

I think this to be a modest and handsome rebuke of the Pride of those two Monks, who valued themselves so much upon their selling their Temporal Possessions; that they censur'd all that did not do the like, as uncapable of God's Kingdom. St. *Austin* shews that he and several others had done the same with less Noise and less spiritual Pride and Censure.

To the fourth about Swearing, he says thus; *Avoid swearing as much as is possible; for it is better not to swear even to the truth than by a custom of Swearing to fall often into Perjury, and always to come in danger of it. But these Men, as far as appears by what I have heard some of 'em talk, do not know what is Swearing; for they think they do not Swear when they say,* God knows, *or,* God is witness, *or,* I call God to witness, upon my Soul; *because it is not said,* By God: *And because such Phrases as the foremention'd are found in the Apostle* Paul: *But even that Phrase which they confess to be Swearing is found in him, when he says,* (86) By your rejoycing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord. *For in the* Greek *this plainly appears to be Swearing: So that the*

(86) 1 Cor. 15. 31.

Year after the Apostles 310.

*cannot take those words in the Latin,* per vestram gloriam, *By your rejoycing; as those* (87) per meum adventum iterum ad vos, *By my coming to you again; and many such like where it is said,* By any thing, *and yet there is no Swearing, are to be taken.*

(87) Phil. 1. 26.

*But because the Apostle, a Man most strong in the Truth, swore in his Epistles, we must not therefore make a sport of Swearing. As for us, it is much safer, as I said, never to swear; but to make use of* Yes, Yes, *and* No, No, *as our Lord advises; not that it is a sin to swear truly, but it is a most dreadful sin to swear falsly, into which he naturally falls that accustoms himself to swear.* This is St. *Austin*'s sense, and whereas some of the Ancienter Fathers are against all Swearing; there was a particular reason in their time, because all the Oaths then administred in Courts were by the Heathen Gods, or the Genii of the Emperors.

The instance that he gives of St. *Paul*'s Swearing is the plainest in the Scripture; for whereas the *Latin* Language uses the word *per*, as the *English* the word, *by*, to many other purposes, as well as Swearing; the *Greek*, as St. *Austin* observes, has a peculiar word νὴ, for *by* in the case of Swearing by any thing, and which is never us'd but in Swearing; as νὴ Διά, and νὴ τὸς Θεὸς: And so νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, is, without any more addition, *I swear* [for which our *English* have put *I protest*] *by your glory* [or, rejoycing] *which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord*, i. e. by that which is our common Christian hope and joy.

§. 22. There came the same year some more questions out of *Sicily* for St. *Austin* to resolve, from *Eutropius* and *Paulus*. They sent him a Paper, intitul'd, *Definitiones, ut dicitur, Celestii*, 'Arguments given out, as is said, by *Celestius*.

It contain'd 14 Arguments, or rather one Argument diversified in Words 14 times, to prove that a Man may be without Sin if he will. That Argument is no other than this dilemma, *God's Commands are either possible or impossible*, &c.

It might be worth the while of a young Sophister to read 'em for a pattern to see how many ways that fallacy may be varied; as, *Sin is either a thing that may be avoided, or that cannot be avoided*, &c. *Sin is either a thing of Will, or of Necessity*, &c. but they are not worth reciting here. St. *Austin* recites 'em, and gives particular answers to each of 'em (89) which must needs be for substance

(89) Lib. de perfectione justitiæ ad Eutropium.

substance the same as he and St. *Hierom* had given before to the Dilemma aforesaid, *viz.* That a Man may by God's Grace have in general a will, desire, and aim to avoid all Sin; but by reason of our frailty, no Man finds that purpose to hold out so steady in all particulars, but that he often slips and sometimes falls. Neither does it do us any good to prove how unblameable we should be on supposition that our will were faultless; since our greatest blemish is the corrupt inclination of our Will it self, which complies with the Tentations, in all Men at sometimes and to some degree; but in Men destitute of God's Grace, so far as to yield the Dominion to Sin. And since this is too plain by Experience, what do Sophisms to the contrary avail us? Our business is to get Cure by God's Grace for this Distemper, not to dispute our selves out of the sense of it. Year after the Apostles 310.

About this time *Pelagius* wrote one of his most Elaborate Pieces, intitul'd, *Of the Abilities of Nature*; to which St. *Austin*, next year, wrote an Answer, intitled, *Of Nature and Grace.* He owns (90) that *Pelagius* had shewn an example of a *most strong and nimble wit*, and had well reproved those that excuse their Wickedness by laying all the fault of it on the nature of Man; but that he had carried this zeal too far, in saying that Men that are Wicked might have been Sinless if they would; and, *That if they were Sinners because they could not be otherwise, they are not to be blamed.* On which St. *Austin* makes this remark, (91) *Mind what he says, Now I say that an Infant born and surprized with death in such a place where he cannot be reliev'd by the Baptism of Christ, is as he is* (viz. *dies without the washing of Regeneration*) *because he could be no otherwise. Let him then absolve such a one, and set open the Kingdom of Heaven to him in spite of our Lord's Declaration*, &c. 314. 315. (90) Cap. 6. (91) Cap. 7.

Among several Arguments as good as the Case would bear, *Pelagius* there uses one very silly logical Quirk. In opposition to what the Church held of our Nature in the state in which it now is, *viz.* That it is deprav'd and weakned by Sin, he said, (92) *What is Sin? Is it any substantial thing; or a Name without any Substance, by which is meant not any real thing, not any Existence, not any bodily thing; but the act of something done amiss? And how can that which has no Substance weaken or change humane nature?* (92) Apud Augustin. de naturâ & gratiâ. cap. 19.

Year after the Apostles 310.

St. *Austin* produces the instance of some godly Man, crying out as it is, *Ps.* 41. 4. *Lord, be merciful to me, heal my Soul, for I have sinned against thee*, &c. He bids *Pelagius* ask such a Man, *What he ails? What is Sin, is it a substance*, &c? *How can a thing that has no substance defile thy Soul?* &c. And then adds, *Would not the Man in the bitterness of his Soul bid him be gone?* &c. *You see whither this Argument tends, and to what it would lead us; to think those words spoken to no purpose*; Thou shalt call his name *Jesus*, for he shall save his People from their Sins. *For how shall he save 'em if they have no ailing? Sins, from which the Gospel says Christ's People are to be sav'd, are no substances, and so cannot defile. Oh, Brother, it were a good thing if you would remember that you are a Christian.*

§. 23. *Pelagius* prov'd that Men may be without Sin by instancing (93) in a great many Persons who had been so, as he pretended, *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Melchisedech*, and 20 more, and in some Women, *Deborah*, *Anna*, *Judith*, &c. *and also the Mother of our Lord and Saviour*; concerning whom he said, That *it is necessary for our Religion that we do confess her to be without Sin.*

(93) Ibid. cap. 363

St. *Austin* answers, *Excepting the holy Virgin* Mary, *concerning whom I am not willing, for the honour of our Lord, to hold any dispute at all when we are talking about Sin* (*Unde enim scimus quod* [*l. quid*] *ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quæ concipere & parere meruit cum quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum? Hac ergo excepta virgine.*) 'For how do we know that '[*or, what*] more Grace was bestowed on her to overcome all Sin, who had the honour to conceive and 'bring forth him who certainly had no Sin? (But this 'Virgin excepted) if we could have called together all 'those Holy Men and Women when they were alive, 'and have askt 'em whether they were without Sin; 'What do you think they would have said? As this 'Man says, or as the Apostle *John* says, ——— They 'would all have cried out with one voice, *If we say that 'we have no Sin, we deceive our selves*, &c.

From what the Papists now a-days say and practise in reference to the Blessed Virgin one would think that all Antiquity had believed her to be Sinless; but by examining we shall find that *Pelagius* here is the first that ever said that she was without Sin. St. *Austin* indeed makes a very modest answer, as thinking it decent for us, in regard to the honour of our Saviour, not to hold any talk

talk about the Sins of his Mother; but as one may guess by this place, and more plainly by some other, he was far from affirming her to be Sinless. He often speaks positively of all Mankind as Sinful, excepting only our Saviour Christ. And for other Fathers, they make no scruple, when it comes in their way, to speak particularly of her failings, as *Chrysostom* on *John* 2. 3. And St. *Hierom* (95) having repeated her *Canticum*, bids *Pelagius* mark, that *she does not call her self* Blessed *for any merit or vertue of her own, but by the mercy of God, who vouchsafed to inhabit in her.*

Year after the Apostles 310.

(95) Dialog. 1.

*Aquinas* having produced, by way of Objection against himself, several Reasons and some Authorities, that she had Sin, (96) answers 'em all with that Text, *Cant.* 4. 7. *Thou art all fair, my love, there is no spot in thee*; and with this Passage of St. *Austin.* Now this is not to his purpose as it stands here; but in *Aquinas*'s Citation the words are alter'd. He reads 'em thus, *Inde enim scimus quòd ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quòd concipere, &c.* 'For we know that more 'Grace was bestow'd on her to overcome all Sin, by this 'that she had the honour to conceive [or, deserved to 'conceive] *&c.* But the Jesuit, *Vasquez*, had something more of honesty; for tho' he would have the words read as *Aquinas* reads 'em; yet he confesses that he found 'em in the Book as I have transcribed 'em. He quotes (97) *Unde enim*, but adds as of his own, or rather, *inde enim*; and he quotes, *quid ei plus gratiæ*; but says, as of his own head, or rather, *quod ei plus gratiæ.* And the word *que*, he does not pretend to alter into *quod* at all.

(96) Aq. Summ. 3. Q. 27. Art. 3, 4.

(97) In tertiam Thomæ. T. 2. Disp. 117. c. 3.

The Edition that *Vasquez* had was more unexceptionable and gives even less occasion to the Popish Alterations, than that out of which I transcribe, which is *Erasmus*'s Printed at *Venice*, 1551. (and his Editions are commonly the least tainted with their Corruptions of the Text) for *Vasquez* reads *quid*, which, together with the sense of the Discourse there, justifies my Alteration. If there were not some Eye kept over these Men, they would both in the Fathers, and in the Scripture too, alter the words, as some of 'em have done here, to serve their turn.

They had better take *Pelagius*'s words, which serve their purpose without any Alteration: It would not be the first time they have borrowed from some Heretical Doctrine which was never own'd in the Ancient Catho-

Year after the Apostles 310.

lick Church. *Pelagius* does not only say, she was Sinless, but makes it a necessary point of Religion to believe so; which fits them to a Hair.

§. 24. *Pelagius* liv'd all this while at *Jerusalem*; but what he wrote was in *Latin*, so that his Opinions were more talk'd of in the *West*, where he had liv'd, and where that Language was understood and spoken, than in the *East* where he now was, because little but *Greek* was read or spoken there.

He could not have found a more convenient retreat than at *Jerusalem*; for *John* the Bishop there, with whom he liv'd, was himself addicted to new Opinions. Both *Epiphanius* and St. *Hierom* had a good while before wrote against him for holding several of the Condemn'd Opinions of *Origen*, to which some of *Pelagius*'s Tenets were pretty near a-kin.

315. About this time there happen'd a meeting of Bishops at *Jerusalem*, and *Orosius*, a young Man, who had been with St. *Austin*, and was now at *Bethlehem* with St. *Hierom*, came to this meeting, and declar'd to 'em what a noise there was in the *West* about some Doctrines publish'd by *Celestius*, and countenanc'd by some Writings of *Pelagius*, and that St. *Austin* had wrote against 'em. And he caused (98) to be read to 'em (as well as could be done by an Interpreter) St. *Austin*'s Letter to *Hilarius*, mention'd before in §. 20, 21. *Pelagius* being ask'd whether he had taught those Doctrines against which St. *Austin* there writes, answer'd, *Who is that* Austin? [or, what is *Austin* to me?] Some in the Council answered, *He that speaks against that Bishop by whose means God has restor'd unity to all* Africa, *deserves to be turn'd out not only from this Assembly, but from the whole Church.*

(98) Orosii Apologetic.

They refer'd to the service St. *Austin* had done in reducing the *Donatists*. But Bishop *John*, who presided, interpos'd for him; and all that was urg'd against him at that time, being this, that he had maintain'd that a Man might live without Sin; *John* said, *If he had maintain'd this to be possible without God's help, it were a thing to be Condemn'd; but since he adds that, what have you to say? Do you deny God's help?* So a squabble arising, and *Orosius*, who could speak no *Greek*, as they no *Latin*, not being able to make them understand the fallacy which *Pelagius* conceal'd under that word, *God's help*, the issue was, that the matter should be referr'd to *Innocent*, Bishop of *Rome*, and that in the mean time *Pelagius* should

keep

keep silence; and so nothing at this meeting was said about original Sin. And *John* the Bishop took occasion quickly after to fall out with *Orosius*; upon which he wrote his *Apologetic*, which is still extant, and out of which some Quotations to our purpose about Infant Baptism might be taken; but they have nothing different from what St. *Austin* and St. *Hierom* and *Pelagius* himself, have; and therefore I shall for Brevity omit 'em. Year after the Apostles 310.

But about the latter end of this year 415. there was another Assembly of 14 Bishops in this Country, at the Town which in Scripture is called *Lydda*, but was then called *Diospolis*, to which *Pelagius* was summon'd; and there he could come off no other way but by denying several of his Opinions, which he had promoted before, and which, (as St. *Austin* makes appear) he for all this denial continued to promote afterward. 319.

The Articles objected to him were taken partly out of some Books of his own, partly out of some Books of *Celestius*, who was look'd on as his Scholar; and partly out of the Acts of a Council at *Carthage*, where *Celestius* had been Condemn'd; and partly out of that Catalogue of new Opinions which *Hilarius* had sent to St. *Austin* out of *Sicily*, and which St. *Austin* refuted in the forementioned Letter.

Of what was cited from his own Books, he denied part, and said the Book was not writ by him, tho' it went under his name. The rest he defended, and put as fair a colour on as he could, which was easie to do, because what he had wrote in *Latin*, (which these Bishops did not understand) he explain'd (99) to them in *Greek*; for he did not speak to them by an Interpreter, as Mr. *Le Clerc* mistakes the Matter) and because his Accusers were not there, being sick, but only their Libel was read.

(99) Aug. de Gestis Palæst. c. 2.

But he himself had been wary in his Expressions, for what *Celestius* had: Of the Articles taken from the Books or Words of *Celestius* he defended some, as, *The possibility of avoiding all Sin, by God's help*, &c. but renounced the rest, in these Words, (1) *The other things, as they confess themselves, were not spoken by me; and so I have no reason to answer for 'em. Yet, for the satisfaction of the holy Synod I do renounce* [anathematizo] *all that do hold so.* So he got off with a whole Skin, but left several of his beloved Opinions behind him Condemn'd, as appears by minding which those were that he renounced.

(1) August. eodem libro.

The

Year after the Apostles 310.

The account of the whole is long, especially of those Articles which bore a dispute in what sense he had spoke or understood 'em. What is most material to give us the sense of the Church at that time, is to recite those which the Council Condemn'd, and he was forc'd to Condemn: Which you have in the Words of St. *Austin* in his Letter to *Paulinus* (2) express'd much shorter than in the Book *De Gestis Palæst.* (where the Acts of this Council are at large recited) but to the same effect. He writes thus,

(2) Epist. 106.

*For beside those Articles which he ventur'd to defend as well as he could, some things were objected to him, which unless he had renounced* [anathematized] *he would have been renounced himself.*

*For it was objected, that he said* [or held,]

1. *That* Adam, *whether he had sinned or not, would have died.*
2. *That his Sin hurt himself only, and not mankind.*
3. *That Infants new born are in the same state that* Adam *was before his fall.*
4. *That neither by the death or fall of* Adam *does all mankind die, nor by the Resurrection of Christ does all mankind arise.*

(3) See above §. 5.

These you see, (3) are the same that had been objected to *Celestius* four years before.

5. *That Infants, tho' they be not Baptized, have eternal Life.*
6. *That rich Men, unless they part with all,* &c. *cannot have the Kingdom of God.*

(4) See §. 20.

These two were taken (4) out of the heads of new Doctrine broached at *Syracuse*.

7. *That the Grace of God is not given in every action; but is in Free-Will; or, in the Law and Doctrine.*

And several other Articles about Grace and Merit.

*All these* Pelagius *did so renounce* [anathematizavit] *as the Acts of the Council do shew, that he did not produce any thing in defence of 'em. From whence it follows, that whosoever will own the Authority of that Episcopal Judgment, and the Confession of* Pelagius *himself, must hold these things (which the Catholick Church has ever held)* viz.

*That* Adam, *if he had not sinned, would not have died.*

That

*That his Sin hurt, not himself only, but Mankind.* Year after the Apostles 310.

*That Infants new born are not in the state that* Adam *was before his fall*, &c.

*That unbaptized Infants will miss, not only of the Kingdom of Heaven, but also of eternal Life*, &c.

Tho' this must needs have cost *Pelagius* a sore pang, yet so it happen'd that the news of his being acquitted in this Council made more noise among the vulgar People to his advantage, than his being compell'd to renounce those Opinions did against his cause, especially in the *West*, where they heard he was acquitted and approved, but did not hear upon what terms. He himself also publish'd accounts of the matter to his own advantage (5), and triumph'd of his success. So that the *Pelagians* were never more uppish than they were for a while after this Synod.

(5) Aug. de Gestis Palæstin. c. 30.

And yet, upon the whole Matter, tho' St. *Austin* does often speak of these Bishops, as having been impos'd on by *Pelagius* in Matter of Fact, and do shew how he disguised and concealed his true meaning from 'em; and tho' he do, in a Letter, which he a little while after this wrote to *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, desiring him to send a Copy of the Acts of the Council, (6) say thus, *As for* Pelagius, *our Brother and your Son, whom I hear you love very well; I advise you so to manage your love to him, that they that know him, and have attentively heard him, may not judge your holiness to be impos'd on by him*, &c. *For when you hear him confess the grace and help of God, you think he means the same that you do, who have a Catholick sense of it, because you don't know what he has wrote in his Book; and for that reason I have sent you his Book, and mine written in answer to it.* And tho' St. *Hierom* do on this account call this Synod, (7) *The pitiful Synod of* Diospolis. Yet, I say, upon the whole matter, it appears by the Acts of this Council, that these Bishops, tho' as St. *Austin* says, (8) *They could not thoroughly examine the Man, yet for the Heresie it self they gave it a deadly Wound.* For by forcing *Pelagius* to declare what he did, about the Sin of *Adam*, the natural state of Infants, and the necessity of God's Grace, and the renouncing of Merit, they shew'd that they were far enough from *Pelagianism*: So that St. *Austin* says, (9) that when he read the Acts of this Council, and before he saw *Pelagius*'s Books of *Free-will*, wherein he return'd to his vomit again, he thought

(6) Epist. 252.

(7) Hieronym. Epist. 79.

(8) De Gestis Pal. c. 21.

(9) Lib. de peccato original. c. 14.

*That*

Year after the Apostles 310. *That this question had been at an end; and that* Pelagius *had plainly owned original Sin in Infants.*

§. 25. This I note the rather because some among us now a-days, that shew a good will to *Pelagianism*, and do strangely shuffle with that 9th Article of the Church of *England*, which is of Original Sin, expounding it all a-way, do shelter themselves under the pretended Authority of the *Greek* Church, asif the *Greek* Fathers had not owned that Doctrine. Whereas not only this Council that acquitted *Pelagius*, yet Condemn'd the Opinions laid to his charge; but also the other Councils of the *Eastern* Nations agreed with the *Latins* in Condemning the said Doctrines, and the Men too when it appeared that they really held such Doctrines.

318. For three years after this, *Theodotus* Bishop of *Antioch*, held a Synod at *Jerusalem*, to which *Pelagius*, was cited, and there Condemned, as is recorded by *Marius Mercator. Commonitor. c.* 3.

And sometime after, *Julian* the *Pelagian* with 17 more of his Party wrote to the Bishop of *Thessalonica*, representing their own Doctrine in the fairest colours, and that of the Catholicks in the *West* in the blackest, hoping to make a Party in the *Greek* Church (10); but found none, or hardly any, that they could bring over.

(10) Aug. ad Bonifac. l. 1. c. 1.

*Celestius*, before his Condemnation at *Rome*, went to *Constantinople*, to try if any interest could be made there. But *Atticus*, the Bishop there, would neither receive him nor his Doctrine (11). St. *Austin* mentions this in short, *l.* 3. *contra Julian. c.* 1. But *Mercator* more at large, *Commonitor. c.* 1. *Some years after he went to* Constantinople *in the time of* Atticus *of holy Memory, where being discover'd to hold such Opinions, he was by the great care of that holy Man, driven from that City; and Letters were sent concerning him into* Asia, *to* Thessalonica, *and* Carthage, *to the Bishops there; of which I have Copies ready to be produced. But the said* Celestius *being driven from hence also went to* Rome, &c.

(11) Acta Concil. Ephes. pt. 1. c. 18.

At *Ephesus* also they were rejected and disowned, *not suffer'd to abide there*, which is the word of *Prosper*, who relates this, *lib. de ingratis, c.* 2. But Mr. *Le Clerc* expresses it, *ill treated.*

331. The only hopeful attempt they ever made in the *Greek* Church was about 15 years after this time, when a general Council being call'd to *Ephesus* on account of *Nestorius* (who had innovated in the Doctrine of the Incarnation)

Incarnation) they joined their Party with his, as is usual for discontented Parties to do; and made in all, at first 43, but quickly dwindled to 30, as appears by the Address of the Council to the Emperor, where they say, *It is an absurd thing that* 30 *Men only* (*some of whom have been a good while ago depos'd, some are of the false opinion of* Celestius, &c.) *should set themselves against a Synod of* 210 *Bishops, with whom all the* Western *Bishops* (*and so the whole world*) *do consent.* They made also Canons (12) that *if any Clergyman did publickly or privately promote the Opinions of* Nestorius, *or* Celestius, *they should be deprived.*

Year after the Apostles 310.

(12) Can. 4.

These things, and more to the same purpose, are largely and particularly quoted out of the Acts of that Council, by Bishop *Usher*, in the forementioned Treatise (13). So that it is hard to guess what these Men get by appealing to the *Greek* Church.

(13) Cap. XI.

And for the *Greek* Fathers before this time, *Vossius* has largely shewn in his *Pelagian History*, that they commonly teach the Doctrine of original Sin. Only he thinks *Clemens Alexandrinus* must be excepted; but Dr. *Hammond* shews (14) that there is no reason for that Exception. *Vossius* is of Opinion that there is no difference between St. *Austin*, and the Ancient *Greek* Fathers about that other point of Predestination, but that (15) *what the ancienter Fathers omitted concerning predestination, he adds,* But, allowing that to be a matter in which Men will always pass various Judgments, and will find each their own Sentiments both in the Scripture and the Fathers; it cannot with any Modesty at all be pretended that they do not own and complain of original Sin, or natural Corruption. 'Tis true, that most of 'em were of Opinion that this Corruption or Sin would in unbaptized Infants be punish'd no otherwise than by the loss of the Kingdom of Heaven. And in this indeed they differ'd from most of the *Latins.*

(14) Annot. on Ps. 51.

(15) De Historicis Latinis, l. 2. c. 1.

Mr. *Le Clerc* says (16), *They that have not so ill an opinion of* Pelagius, *as St.* Austin *had, do say, that if St.* Austin *had been able to read the* Greek *Doctors, he would have found that they speak no otherwise than* Pelagius *does; as may,* says he, *be seen in a great many places in St.* Chrysostom, *and in* Isidore *of* Pelusium, *whom some Moderns have openly accus'd of* Pelagianism.

(16) Bib. Universf. T. 8. pag. 192.

By

Year after the Apostles 310.

By singling out St. *Chrysostom* he follows the steps of the old *Pelagians*, for it appears out of St. *Austin*'s Books against *Julian* the *Pelagian*, *lib.* 1. and *lib.* 3. that he and *Anianus* do make their chief boast of St. *Chrysostom*, and do fetch more for their purpose out of him than out of any other *Greek* Writer. They translated some of his Orations that were most for their turn; and St. *Austin*, tho' not very conversant indeed in the *Greek* Language, yet shewed that he could read and tolerably understand it by giving instances wherein they had made them more for their purpose than they were, by their Translation, as I recited before in *CH. XIV.* And besides, he answered them by producing other places of his, where he plainly owns original Sin; which is the only way one has to save the Credit of a Preacher that gives so much scope to the vein of Oratory and Harangue, that take what he says at several times, and compare it, and you will hardly make it consistent.

And for other *Greek* Doctors, who were more to be regarded (for St. *Chrysostom* was no Ancienter than St. *Austin* himself) he shews the Doctrine of *Irenæus*, St. *Basil*, St. *Gregory*, *&c.* to have been clear and full in this matter, and says (17), tho' he had a Translation of the Sermon of St. *Basil*, which he quoted (18), yet *he chose rather to Translate it himself word for word out of the* Greek, *that it might be more exact.* The like he does in the same Book with two passages of St. *Chrysostom*, setting down the *Greek* words. So that the foresaid censure past on him has more in it of the assuming humour of a Critick, than it has of truth or good manners.

(17) Lib. 1. contra Julian.
(18) Sermo de jejunio.

And to expect of St. *Austin* that he should have read *Isidore* to know the sense of the *Greek* Church, is (if one consider the Age of each) a Jest indeed.

I gave some instances above in *CH. XIV.* where both St. *Chrysostom* and this *Isidore*, and also *Theodoret* (for they all run in one vein, and the two latter shew a great Ambition to imitate the former) have Expressions something like those of *Pelagius* about Infant Baptism, *viz.* *That Infants are Baptiz'd tho' they have no Sins*; where yet it appears by Circumstances that their meaning was only that they had no actual ones.

And for *Anianus*, where he boasts of St. *Chrysostom* and says (19), *How agreeably does he every where speak to the Books of our Men*, &c? All the instance he produces is out of some Orations of his in Praise of St. *Paul* where

(19) Anian. Epist. ad Evangelum apud Bedam. T. 6.

where, as *Anianus* will have it, he has proved St. *Paul* to have been without Sin, which the *Pelagians* maintain'd to be a feazable thing. Year after the Apostles 310.

*First*, says *Anianus*, *by preferring him above all the Saints, and equalling him to Angels.*

*2dly, By proving from his vertues and from his sayings the goodness of our nature*, &c,

*6thly, By answering all those places by which the* Traducian [this is a nickname he gives to St. *Austin*] *does defile* Paul *with the stain of Faults* [*i. e.* proves that St. *Paul* had some Sins] *that he may incourage his followers to Sin by the Example of an Apostle.*

*7thly, By extolling his Zeal*, &c. *that it may plainly appear that all necessity of sinning is taken away; which in opposition to the* Manichees [i. e. the Catholicks] *both the Doctrine and Life of the Apostle does disprove.*

Now it cannot be denied but St. *Chrysostom* in those Orations does lash out on these Subjects; but yet one that reads 'em will never conclude that he thought in earnest that St. *Paul* was without Sin, any more than one of us does think so. But he was got on St. *Paul*'s day into a high flight of Oratory in his Commendation; in which Cases such Men often use Expressions very Hyperbolical. And to conclude points of Doctrine from such Rhetorical Harangues is the property only of such unskilful arguers as St. *Hierom* (20) represents this *Anianus* to be. It was much the like sort of ill use made of some over-reaching Expressions used at the Funeral Orations of Holy Men that has since given ground to the worship and Prayers offer'd to them. (20) Epist. 79.

However it be, it makes one think over again of that advice which is lately given us by a great Man amongst our selves, who of all the Fathers, recommends St. *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret* particularly to our reading. Certainly they were not inclined to *Pelagianism*; for if they had, he would never have singled out them in his recommendation to us.

§. 26. About the same time that the Synod of *Diospolis* was held, S. *Hierom* publish'd his three Books against the Opinions of *Pelagius* (not naming him, but sufficiently decyphering him) in form of *Dialogues* between a *Pelagian* and a *Catholick*, under the feigned names of *Atticus* and *Critobulus*; *Atticus* representing the *Catholick*, and *Critobulus* the *Pelagian*. The far greatest part of 'em, (which I must omit) is taken up in setting forth 315.

the

Year after the Apostles 310.

the pride and presumption of that Tenet of *Pelagius*, that a Man may in this Life be without Sin; which had been so smartly done by *Atticus*, that toward the end of the *third Dialogue*, *Critobulus* reckoning that he could maintain this to be true in the case of Infants at least, if not of grown Persons, says thus,

CRIT. *I can hold no longer; all my patience is overcome by your provoking way of talk. I pray tell me wherein have Infants sinned? Neither can the Conscience of any fault, nor can their ignorance be imputed to them, who according to that of the Prophet* Jonah, *know not their right hand from their left. They are in no case to commit Sin, and yet they are in a case to Perish; their Knees double under 'em; their tender Age can utter no words; with a Mouth that would speak if it could, they give a smile; and the torment of eternal Misery is prepared for the poor Babes.*

ATT. *Oh! you are grown mighty Eloquent,* &c.——— *But don't run upon me with your flowers of Rhetorick (which are none of your own neither) with which the ears of Boys and shallow Men are wont to be caught; but tell me plainly what you would say of 'em.*

CRIT. *This I say; grant me but this, that they at least who cannot Sin, are without Sin.*

ATT. *I shall grant it, provided they be Baptized in Christ; and yet you shall not bring me to yield to your Proposition,* That a Person may be without Sin, if he will. *These have neither power nor will, but they are free from all Sin by the Grace of God, which they receive in Baptism.*

CRIT. *You will force me to come to that invidious question, and to say,* What Sin had they? *That you may make the People presently throw stones at me; and that when you can't murder me by strength, you may by a device.*

ATT. *He murders a Heretick that suffers him to continue such,* &c.

CRIT. *Tell me, I beseech you, and free me from all doubt; for what reason are Infants Baptiz'd?*

ATT. *That in Baptism their Sins may be forgiven.*

CRIT. *What Sin have they incurr'd? Is any one loosed that never was bound?*

ATT. *Do you ask me? That Trumpet of the Gospel, that Teacher of the Gentiles, that golden Vessel shining thro' all the World, shall answer you.* 'Death reigned from *Adam* to '*Moses* even over those who had not sinned after the Similitude

Year after the Apostles 316.

militude of *Adam's* Transgression, which is the figure of him that was to come, *&c.* [he goes on to recite the fifth Chapter to the *Romans.*] *And if you object that it is said, that there were some that had not sinned; understand it, that they sinned not that Sin which* Adam *committed in Paradise, by breaking God's command. But all Persons are held obnoxious either by their own, or by their Forefather* Adam's *Sin. He that is an Infant is in Baptism loosed from the bond of his Forefather; he that is of Age to understand, is by the Blood of Christ freed both from his own bond; and also from that which is derived from another.*

*And that you may not think that I understand this in an Heretical* [or, Heterodox] *sense; the blessed Martyr* Cyprian (*whom you pretend to have imitated in collecting into order some places of Scripture*) *in the Epistle which he writes to Bishop* Fidus, *about the Baptizing of Infants, says thus,*

'If then the greatest Offenders, and they that have 'grievously sinned against God before, have, when they 'afterwards come to believe, forgiveness of their Sins; 'and no Person is kept off from Baptism and the Grace: 'How much less reason is there to refuse an Infant, 'who being newly born has no Sin; save that being 'descended from *Adam*, according to the flesh, he has 'from his very Birth contracted the Contagion of the 'death anciently threatned, *&c.*?

He goes on to recite *verbatim* all the rest of the Epistle to the end; which I recited before in *CH. VI.* §. 1. and then proceeds;

*That holy and accomplish'd Person, Bishop* Austin, *wrote some time ago to* Marcellinus (*who was afterward, tho' innocent, put to death by the Hereticks, on pretence that he had a hand in* Heraclius's *Usurpation*) *two Books concerning the Baptism of Infants, against your Heresie, by which you would maintain that Infants are Baptiz'd, not for forgiveness of Sins; but for the Kingdom of Heaven; according to that which is written in the Gospel,* Except a Person be born again of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. *And a third Book to the said* Marcellinus, *against those that say (what you say) that a Man may, without the Grace of God, be without Sin, if he will. And a fourth to* Hilarius, *against your Doctrine*

Year after the Apostles 310.

*that brings up so many odd things. And, they say, he is setting out some more Books particularly relating to you; which are not yet come to my hands. So that I think it proper for me to spare my pains on this subject, lest that of* Horace *be said to me,* Never carry Timber into the Woods. *For either I must superfluously say the same that he has said, or else, if I would say any new things, his excellent Wit has forestall'd all the best,*

*This one thing I will say, that this Discourse may at last have an end; either you must set forth a new* Creed, *and after the* Father, *the* Son, *and the* Holy Ghost, *Baptize Infants unto the* Kingdom of Heaven: *Or else, if you acknowledge* One Baptism *for Infants, and for grown Persons, you must own that Infants are to be Baptiz'd for* Forgiveness of Sins; *Sins after the Similitude of* Adam's *Transgression.*

*And if the forgiveness of Sins, which are the Sins of another, do seem to you unjust, or such as he that could commit no Sin himself has no need of; then march over to* your Beloved (21), *who holds that in Baptism are forgiven those old Sins which have been committed in a former state in the Celestial Regions; and so as you are influenc'd by his Authority in your other points, partake with his error in this too.*

(21) Origen.

Tho' St. *Hierom,* after having in these *Dialogues* largely confuted the other errors of *Pelagius,* do insist but briefly on this proof of original Sin from the Baptism of Infants, as being a matter which had been fully handled by St. *Austin* in the Books he here mentions, and of which I gave some account before (22), yet this little seems to have nettled and puzzled *Pelagius* more than all that was said by St. *Austin.* The *Pelagians* confessed that adult Persons were Baptiz'd for *forgiveness of Sins*; but Infants having no Sins were Baptiz'd only for the *Kingdom of Heaven.* This was to establish two sorts of Baptism, which was contrary to that Article of the *Constantinopolitan Creed,* then received in all the World; *I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of Sins. Pelagius* could never get clear from this Argument. And it appears by his answer, which we shall see presently, that he yielded more to the force of it, than of any other.

(22) §. 6. 7, &c. ad 22.

But

But in the mean time, and quickly after the Synod of *Diospolis*, he publiſhed four Books *pro libero arbitrio, In defence of Free-will*, in which, beſide what he has about the point of God's Grace, he does, as St. *Auſtin* expreſſes it (23), *not by any ſly intimation* [as formerly] *but in a moſt open manner, maintain by all the force of Argument he can, that humane Nature in Infants is in no manner polluted by derivation* [or, birth]. St. *Auſtin* gives there (24) an inſtance of one of his ſayings, in the firſt of the ſaid four Books.

Year after the Apoſtles 316.

(23) De peccato originali, Cap. 21.

(24) Cap. 13.

*All the good or evil for which we are to be praiſed, or blamed, does not come into the World with us, but is acted by us, for we are born capable of either of theſe; not full* [or, poſſeſs'd] *of either of 'em. And as we are at firſt form'd without any virtue, ſo likewiſe without any vice. And there is in a Perſon, before the actings of his own will, nothing but what God has created,* [or, put into him].

When People wonder'd how he could reconcile this with what he had ſaid in the ſaid Synod, where he had, as was ſhew'd before (25), anathematiz'd all that held any of theſe Opinions: 1. *That* Adam's *Sin hurt himſelf only, and not Mankind.* 2. *That Infants new born are in the ſame ſtate that* Adam *was before his fall.* 3. *That Infants, tho' not baptized, have eternal Life.* He invented theſe ſalvoes, which St. *Auſtin* mentions in a Book written ſome time after (26), and which ſhews that he had a faculty of Juggling and Equivocation enough for a Jeſuit.

(25) §. 24.

(26) De pecc. origin. c. 15.

1. That it might be ſaid truly enough, that *Adam*'s Sin did hurt Mankind as well as himſelf. But how? *Not by derivation, but by the ill example it gave.* The *Socinians* may thank him for this Explication; for it helps them to much ſuch another about Chriſt's death doing good to Mankind.

2. That Infants new born are not in the ſame ſtate that *Adam* was before his fall, is true enough. But for a reaſon very different from what thoſe Biſhops whom he banter'd, could imagine, *viz. Becauſe he was a Man and they are but Children.*

3. All the reaſon he could give for his condemning thoſe that ſaid, *Unbaptized Infants ſhall have eternal Life*, was a ſaying which he often had in his mouth, (27) *As for Infants that die without Baptiſm, I know whither they do not go; but whither they do go, I know not*, i. e.

(27) Aug. de c. 21.

Year after the Apostles 310.

*I know they do not go to the Kingdom of Heaven; but what becomes of 'em I know not.*

'Tis plain enough from many places in St. *Austin* that his Followers held, that they should have a certain *eternal Life*, but not in the Kingdom of Heaven. But he himself, it seems, at least at this time, to salve what he had said in the Synod, renounc'd those that determin'd so, and kept himself in reserve concerning their future state.

(28) Ibid. c. 16.

St. *Austin*'s note on all this, is, (28) *Does he think that when these Propositions were set him to condemn in one sense, he does, by expounding 'em in another sense, make it out, that he did not deceive his Judges? So far from that, that he deceiv'd 'em so much the more slily as he now explains himself the more craftily.*

316. §. 28. The next year two Councils were held in *Africa*, both about the same time; one at *Carthage* of 68 Bishops, the other at *Milevis*, for the Province of *Numidia*, of 61 Bishops. They had not then seen *Pelagius*'s last four Books, and had but an imperfect account of what had pass'd at *Diospolis*. But they found it necessary to condemn the *Pelagian* Opinions; which had taken some footing in those Countries, but much more at *Rome*; and therefore they both of 'em did by Synodical Epistles written to *Innocent* Bishop of *Rome*, desire the concurrence of that Church; not that they thought their own Decrees invalid without a Confirmation from *Rome*, but because *Rome* was most infected. With which desire *Innocent* did very cordially comply in his Answers; which answers, tho' written the year after, I shall recite here, leaving out both in the Epistles and Answers the greatest part, which is about Grace, but inserting what they say about Infants.

316. (29) Apud Augustinum, Epist. 90.

## *The Synodical Epistle of the Council of* Carthage *to* Innocent (29).

They take notice of the report that *Pelagius* had been acquitted at the Council of *Diospolis*, by denying most of the Tenets objected to him; and then say,

*If* Pelagius *do seem to your Reverence also justly acquitted by those Episcopal Acts which are said to have passed in the* East, *yet the error it self and the impiety which has so many Abettors in several places, ought to be Condemn'd by the Authority of the Apostolick See. Let your Holiness then consider, and have a fellow-feeling with us in your Pastoral Bowels, how mischievous and destructive a thing that is to the Sheep of Christ, which follows from their sacrilegious Disputations; That we need not* pray that we enter not into Temptation, *&c.* Year after the Apostles 316.

They proceed to shew the necessity of praying for God's assisting Grace, from *Luke* 22. 32. *Eph.* 3. 14, *&c.* And then conclude their Letter thus,

*They say also,* 'That Infants are not to be Baptiz'd 'for that Salvation which is given by Christ as a Sa-'viour; *and so they kill 'em eternally by their pernicious Doctrine. They maintain that,* 'Tho' they should not 'be Baptiz'd, yet they would have an eternal Life; 'and that they are not of those of whom our Lord 'says, *The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which 'was lost; for these,* say they, *were not lost,* neither is there 'any thing in them that needs saving or redeeming at 'so great a Price. For there is nothing in them that 'is corrupted, nothing that is held captive under the 'power of the Devil; nor was the Blood which was 'shed for forgiveness of Sins, shed for them. *Tho'* Celestius *has by his Book, formerly* (30) *given in to the Church of* Carthage, *owned that Infants have* Redemption *by the Baptism of Christ. But a great many who are said to be, or to have been, their Disciples, do not cease with all their might to uphold these Evils, by which they endeavour to overthrow the Christian Faith.*

(30) Five years before.

*So that suppose* Pelagius *and* Celestius *be reformed, or do say that they never held these things, and do deny that any of the Writings produced against them are theirs, and the contrary cannot be proved; yet in the general, whoever maintains these Tenets, and does affirm,* That human Nature can be sufficient of it self to overcome Sin, and keep God's Commandments, *and so is an Adversary to the Grace of God which is plainly prov'd from the Prayers of Holy Men: And,* Quicunque negat parvulos per baptismum Christi à perditione liberari, & salutem percipere sempiternam; *Whoever denies that Infants are by Christian Baptism deliver'd from* Perdition, *and brought to eternal Salvation; let him be anathema.*

Year after the Apostles 316.

*And for the other things that are objected to them, we doubt not but your Reverence will, when you shall have seen the Episcopal Acts which are said to have passed in the* East, *judge so as to give occasion to us all to rejoyce in the mercy of God.*

## *The Synodical Epistle of the* Milevitan *Council to* Innocent (31).

316. (31) Apud Augustinum, Epist. 92.

They represent to him that there was *a new Heresie sprung up of Men that were Enemies to the Grace of Christ, who went about to deprive People of the benefit of the Lord's Prayer*, &c. And after many things said on that Subject, they add,

*Also they do by a wicked presumption contend that little Infants shall have an eternal Life, tho' they be not renewed by the Sacraments of the Christian Grace; making that of no effect, which the Apostle says,* By one Man Sin enter'd into the World, *&c.*

*Therefore to omit many other things which they discourse against the holy Scriptures, these two things, which do support the Hearts of the faithful, and in which they go about to subvert all our Christianity, viz.* That God is not to be prayed to, to be our helper against the evil of Sin, and for working Righteousness; *and*, that the Sacrament of the Christian Grace is not helpful to Infants for obtaining eternal Life; *These when we have signified to your Apostolical breast, we have not need to say much*, &c.

(32) Inter Epistolas Augustini. Epist. 95.

There was another Letter (32) written to *Innocent* at the same time, and on the same subject in a more familiar style, by five Bishops, who, I suppose, had some personal Acquaintance with him, *viz. Aurelius*, who had made one at the Council of *Carthage*; *Alipius*, St. *Austin*, and *Possidius*, who had been in the other Council; and *Euodius*, whose name is to neither of 'em. They give him to understand that they hear there are several at *Rome*, who do favour *Pelagius*; some who are brought over to his Opinion; others, that will not believe he is of that Opinion. That in all probability *Pelagius* had impos'd upon the Bishops at *Diospolis*, who, when they heard him own the *Grace of God*, could think no other but that he meant that Grace by which we are made good Christians, and not that only by which we are made rational Men; whereas he, in his Books, (which the Bishops

Year after the Apostles 316.

hops of *Diospolis* had not seen) says to God in effect, *Thou hast made us Men, but we have made our selves good Men.* Therefore they advise him to send for *Pelagius* to *Rome*, or to deal with him by Letters; that if he will explain himself in a Catholick sense, he may be acquitted indeed.

To that purpose St. *Austin* sends to *Innocent* a Letter that he had written to *Pelagius*, desiring him to send it to him; *For then*, says he, *he will the rather vouchsafe to read it, regarding more him that sent it than him that wrote it.*

They sent him withal a Book of *Pelagius*'s; I suppose, that *de viribus Naturæ*, spoken of in §. 22.

317. *Innocent* returned three Letters in answer to these three. They are the 91, 93, and 96, that are Printed among the Letters of St. *Austin*. He agrees perfectly with them in the points of Doctrine, and in the Proofs that they had brought for 'em. And for the case of Infants particularly he says (33), That which *Pelagius* and *Celestius* do teach, *viz.* that they may have eternal Life without Baptism, is *perfatuum, very absurd.* He says, they would by this means *make their Baptism of no use.* That *if it did 'em no hurt that they are not regenerated, then the same Men must hold that the Waters of Regeneration do 'em no good.* It seems probable by these words, that this Pope did not understand how *Pelagius* distinguish'd between *eternal Life* and the *Kingdom of Heaven*, In fine, he gives his Sentence, that they are to be accounted Excommunicate, till they do repent and recant.

(33) Epist. 93.

And to what St. *Austin* and the other four had desired, that he would send for *Pelagius*, or write to him, he answers (34),

(34) Epist. 96.

*He ought rather to come himself that he may be absolved, for if he be still of the same opinion, when will he ever commit himself to our Judgment, how many Letters soever be sent him, when he knows he must be Condemn'd? And if he were to be sent for, it might be better done by them that are nearer him, and not separated by so great a space of Land. But yet, if he will give any room for Medicine, our care shall not be wanting; for he may condemn the Opinions he has been of, and send his Letters, and ask pardon for his error, as becomes one that returns to us.*

Year after the Apostles 316. *For his Book which you sent, I have read it, in which find a great many blasphemous things*, &c.

317. §. 29. These Letters of *Innocent* are dated in *January* 417, and he died the *March* following. And whether he had before his Death wrote to *Pelagius*, or whether *Pelagius* had heard of what passed, he did write to *Innocent* an Apologetick Letter, and sent withal *Libellum fidei, a written account of his Faith.* In which he endavours both to shew his own Faith to be blameless, and also to be even with St. *Hierom* for his *Dialogue*; so that *Julian* calls it (35) an answer to them. But *Innocent* being dead before they came, they were delivered to *Zosimus*, who had been chosen Bishop in his sted. *Celestius* also came thither himself, and published ad gave into the hands of *Zosimus* his *Libellus*, or *Draught of Faith* likewise.

(35) Apud Augustin. Operis imperfecti lib. 4. c. 87.

Some Learned Men (36) make *Celestius* to have published two Treatises at *Rome*, at this time; one called *Confessio fidei Zosimo Papæ oblata*, and the other, *Ad Zosimum Papam libellus*. And that the *Confessio fidei* was in a manner the same with *Pelagius*'s *Libellus* in Sentences and Words. And that *Pelagius*'s *Libellus* is that which goes under the name of St. *Hierom*'s *Explanatio Symboli ad Damasum*. And *Celestius*'s *Confessio fidei*, is for the greatest part the same with that which goes for St. *Austin*'s *Sermo* 191 *de Tempore*.

(46) *F. Garner* and Dr. *Cave*, Hist. literar. in Pelagio & Celestio.

But *Celestius* published but one, which may be called, *Confessio fidei*, or, *Libellus fidei*; S. *Austin* always calls it by the latter name. And that did considerably differ from *Pelagius*'s *Libellus*, being (as St. *Austin* observes, (37) and we shall see) *much more frank and open in the denial of original Sin.*

(37) De peccato Orig. Cap. 2.

And whereas they make one to be like the *Explanatio Symboli* in St. *Hierom*, and the other to be in a manner the same with the *Sermo* 191. in St. *Austin*'s works, these two are not only in a manner the same, but are the very same, (being *Pelagius*'s *Libellus* foresaid) saving a few various Lections, and saving that that in St. *Austin*'s Works has an impertinent Preface affixt to the beginning, and a bit cut off from the end by some idle Monk, to make it serve for a Sermon.

I shall recite it here at large (tho' a small part of it only do relate to our purpose) and add a few short notes on it. And this I do for two reasons.

I. For

1. For the credit of *Pelagius*, and of our Country; St. *Austin* always speaks of him as a Man of extraordinary Capacity and Accomplishments, and one whom he should much admire and love, were it not for his Heterodox Opinions. And the Works of his that are left, do shew him a Man of very good parts. There are none left intire but this, and a Letter of his to *Demetrius*. Both that Letter is as Polite and (as *Orosius* expresses it) elaborate a piece as any that Age afforded; and also this Confession of his Faith is as handsomely and learnedly Penn'd as any of the Creeds drawn up by private Men of that time, whereof there were many; save that he does not speak home to the clearing of that point on which he was question'd. And yet tho' these are by much the most ancient Pieces extant that ever were written by one born in our Country, they have never yet been published in our Language. Year after the Apostles 317. 317.

2*ly*. I do it that I may put our *Socinians* out of love with him: They do much hug some notions of his, which being first dress'd up and represented plausible for their turn in *French*, they have translated and published in *English*. But they shall see that how well soever he please 'em in some of their lesser errors, yet as to their main Article he is their mortal Enemy, and counts 'em worthy of an Anathema; being as Decretory against 'em as *Athanasius*, or *Austin*, or any of the Ancient Catholic Christians were whose names they hate.

His Creed is this, sent with a Letter to Pope *Innocent*, but finding him dead, as I said.

'WE believe in God the Father Almighty, maker 1.
'of all things visible and invisible. We believe
'also in the Lord *Jesus Christ*, by whom all things were
'created, very God, the only begotten, the true Son of
'God, not made or adopted one, but begotten: Of
'one substance with the Father, which the *Greeks* ex-
'press by ὁμοούσιον: and in such a manner equal in all things
'with the Father that he cannot be [accounted] infe-
'rior either in time, or degree, or power. And we ac-
'knowledge him that is begotten to be of the same
'greatness as he is that begot him.

'And

Year after the Apostles 317.

'And whereas we say, the Son is *begotten* of the 'Father, we do not ascribe any time to that Divine 'and Ineffable Generation; but do mean, that neither 'the Father nor the Son had any beginning. For we 'cannot otherwise confess the Father to be Eternal, un- 'less we do also confess the Son to be Co-eternal; for 'he is called the Father, as having a Son, and he who 'ever was a Father, ever had a Son.

b. 'We believe also in the Holy Spirit, very God, 'proceeding from the Father, equal in all things with 'the Father and the Son, in Power, in Will, in Eterni- 'ty, in Substance. Neither is there any degree [*or,* '*graduation*] in the Trinity; nothing that can be cal- 'led superior or inferior, but the whole Deity is equal 'in its perfection: So that except the words that signifie 'the propriety of the Persons, whatsoever is said of one 'Person, may very well be understood of all three.

'And as in Confutation of *Arius*, we say that the sub- 'stance of the Trinity is one and the same, and do own 'one God in three Persons; so avoiding the impiety of '*Sabellius*, we distinguish three Persons expressed by their 'Property; not saying that the Father is a Father to himself, 'nor the Son a Son to himself, nor the Holy Spirit the Spi- 'rit of himself; but that there is one Person of the Fa- 'ther, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit. 'For we acknowledge not only [*several*] Names, but c. 'also properties of the Names, that is, Persons; or, as 'the *Greeks* express them, *Hypostases*. Nor does the Fa- 'ther at any time exclude the Person of the Son, or 'of the Holy Spirit; nor again does the Son, or Holy 'Spirit, receive the Name or Person of the Father; 'but the Father is always Father, the Son always Son, 'and the Holy Spirit always Holy Spirit: So that they 'are in substance one Thing, but are distinguish'd by Per- 'sons and by Names.

'And we say, that this Son of God, who, with the 'Father and the Holy Spirit, inherited Eternity with- 'out any beginning, did, in the end of the World take 'upon him, of *Mary*, who was always a Virgin, per- 'fect Man of our Nature; and the *WORD* was made '*Flesh*, by taking Manhood to him, not by altering his 'Deity.

d. 'And we do not say that the Holy Spirit was in- 'stead of Seed, as a certain Person does most impious- 'ly hold; [*or, as some very impious People hold*] but

'that

'that he operated by the power and influence of the Creator. Year after the Apostles 317.

'And we do in such a manner hold that there is in 'Christ one Person of the Son, as that we say there 'are in him two perfect and intire Substances [*or, Na-* '*tures*], *viz.* of the Godhead, and of the Manhood which 'consists of Body and Soul.

'And as we do condemn *Photinus*, who confesses in 'Christ only a mere Man; so we do Anathematize *A-* '*pollinaris*, and all of that sort who say that the Son of 'God did take on him any thing less than the whole 'human Nature, and that the Man [*or, Manhood*] 'which was assumed, was either in Body, or in Soul, 'or in Mind, unlike to those for whose sake it was 'assumed; whom we do hold to have been like unto 'us, saving only the stain of Sin, which is not natural e. 'to us.

'We do also abhor in like manner the Blasphemy 'of those who go about by a new Interpretation to 'maintain, that since the time of his taking Flesh, all 'things pertaining to the Divine Nature, did pass into 'the Man [*or, Manhood*] and so also that all things be- 'longing to the Humane Nature, were transferred into f. 'God [*or, the Divine Nature*]. From whence would fol- 'low (a thing that no Heresie ever offer'd to affirm) 'that both Substances [*or, Natures*] *viz.* Of the Divi- 'nity and the Humanity, would by this Confusion 'seem to be extinguish'd, and to lose their proper 'state, and be chang'd into another thing. So that 'they who own in the Son an imperfect God, and an im- 'perfect Man, are to be accounted not to hold truly ei- 'ther God or Man.

'But we do hold that our Nature capable of suf- 'fering was so assumed by the Son of God, as that the 'Divinity did remain incapable of suffering. For the 'Son of God suffered (not in appearance only, but real- 'ly) all those things which the Scripture speaks of, *i. e.* 'Hunger, Thirst, Weariness, Pain, Death, and the like; 'but he suffer'd in that Nature which was capable of 'suffering, *i. e.* not in that Nature which did assume, but 'in that which was assumed. For the Son of God is in 'respect of his Godhead incapable of suffering, as the Fa- 'ther; incomprehensible, as the Father; invisible, as the 'Father. And tho' the proper Person of the Son, that is, 'the WORD of God, did take on him Humanity ca-

'pable

Year after the Apostles 317.

'pable of suffering; yet the Godhead of the WORD 'in its own Nature did not suffer any thing by the inhabi-'ting of the Humanity; as did not the whole Trinity, 'which we must of necessity confess to be incapable 'of suffering. The Son of God therefore died accord-'ing to the Scriptures, in respect of that which was ca-'pable of dying.

'The third day he rose again. He ascended into Hea-'ven. He sits on the right hand of God the Father; 'the same Nature of Flesh still remaining in which he 'was born, and suffered, in which also he rose again. 'For the Nature of his Humanity is not extinguish'd, 'but is glorified, being to continue for ever with the 'Divinity.

'Having therefore received of the Father the power 'of all things in Heaven and Earth, he will come to 'judge the living and the dead; that he may reward 'the Just, and punish the Sinners.

'We do also believe the Resurrection of the Flesh, in 'such a manner as to say that we shall be restored a-
g. 'gain in the same truth of our Limbs, in which we are 'now; and that we shall for ever remain such as we 'shall be once made after the Resurrection.

'That there is one Life for the Saints, but rewards dif-'ferent according to their Labour: As on the other side 'the punishments of wicked Men shall be according to 'the measure of their Sins.

h. *Baptisma unum tenemus, quod iisdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus quibus etiam in majoribus asserimus esse celebrandum.*

'We hold *one Baptism*, which we say ought to be ad-'ministred with the same Sacramental words to *Infants* 'as it is to elder Persons.

i. 'If after Baptism a Man do fall, we believe he may 'be recovered by repentance [*or, penance.*]

k. 'We receive the Old and New Testament in the same 'number of Books as the Authority of the Holy Catho-'lic Church doth deliver.

l. 'We believe that our Souls are given by God, and
m. 'we hold that they are made by him; Anathematizing 'those who say, that Souls are, as it were, a part of the
n. 'Substance of God. We do also condemn those who say, 'that the Souls have sinned in a former state, or that they 'have lived in the Celestial Regions, before they were 'sent into Bodies.

'We

'We do also abhor the Blasphemy of those who say 'that any impossible thing is commanded to Man by God; 'or, that the Commandments of God cannot be per- 'formed by any one Man, but that by all Men taken 'together they may. Or, that do condemn first Mar- 'riages in compliance with *Manichæus*, or second Mar- 'riages in compliance with the *Montanists*. Year after the Apostles 317. o.

'Also we do Anathematize those who say that the Son 'of God did tell lyes by necessity of the Flesh; and that 'because of the Humane Nature which he had taken 'on him, he could not do all things that he would. p.

'We do also condemn the Heresie of *Jovinian*, who says 'that in the Life to come there will be no difference of 'merits [*or, rewards*] and that we shall have there Ver- 'tues [*or, Graces*] which we took no care to have 'here. q.

'Free-will we do so own as to say, that we always 'stand in need of God's help; and that as well they are in 'an error, who say with *Manichæus*, that a Man can- 'not avoid Sin, as they who affirm with *Jovinian*, that 'a Man cannot Sin. For both of these take away the 'freedom of the Will. But we say, that a Man always 'is in a state that he may Sin, or may not Sin; so as to 'own our selves always to be of a Free-will. r.

'This is, most blessed Pope, our Faith, which we have 'learn'd in the Catholic Church, and have always held. 'In which if there be any thing that is perhaps unwa- 'rily or unskilfully express'd; we desire it may be a- 'mended by you, who do hold both the Faith and the 'See of *Peter*. And if our Confession be approved by 'the Judgment of your Apostleship, then whoever shall 'have a mind to find fault with me, will shew, not me 'to be a Heretic, but himself unskilful or spiteful, or 'even no Catholic.

This Creed for so ancient a one (for it is much anci- enter than that which goes under the name of *Athanasius*, and within thirty six years of the *Constantinopolitan*) is very express and particular in reference to the holy Trinity: And St. *Austin* finds no fault with it as to that matter; he only says (38), *After he has ended a Discourse as long as he pleased, from the Unity of the Trinity to the Resurrection of the Flesh, which no body demanded of him, he says*, &c. a. (38) De gratiâ Christi, c. 32.

It

Year after the Apostles 317. It is to be noted that he had, before he fell into any Heresie, written *three Books concerning the Faith of the Trinity*; which *Gennadius* in the Catalogue he gives (39) of *Pelagius*'s Books commends as useful ones. And since they are lost, this Creed may serve for an Abridgment of 'em.

(39) De Scrip. Eccl. c. 42.

And here I will make a remark on the Title of another Book of his, which *Gennadius* there mentions, which is lost, except a few fragments. For why should not I, as well as others, take a little pride in the mending the writing of an ancient Book? *Pelagius* gathered together, and publish'd some select places of Scripture relating to moral Duties and the practical part of Religion. *Gennadius* recites the Title of this Book. It is in the ordinary Editions, *Pro actuali conversatione Eulogiarum ex Divinis Scripturis liber unus, capitulorum indiciis in modum Cypriani Martyris præsignatus. Eulogiarum* there is no sense. So some have put instead of it the *Greek* ἐυλογιῶν; and others have made other guesses. But I have a very old Edition of some of St. *Hierom*'s Works, *Ven.* 1476. in which this passage of *Gennadius* is recited at two several places; in one it is *Eulogarum*, in the other it is *Æglogarum*: So that I make no doubt but the true writing was *Eclogarum*; and so the Title of the Book was plainly this, *Collections of the Texts of holy Scripture, concerning a Mans actual Conversation.* This is that Book of his, to which St. *Hierom* refers when he, in the passage even now (40) recited, speaking to *Pelagius*, says, *The blessed Martyr* Cyprian, *whom you pretend to have imitated in collecting into order some places of holy Scripture*, &c.

(40) §. 26.

The same Edition that I mentioned would help to correct several places in the Text of St. *Hierom* himself, which are deprav'd, and some of 'em, I doubt, on purpose.

b. *Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father.*] No Creed at this time had any more. His procession from the Son also, has been since put into the *Constantinopolitan* by the *Latins.* So also afterward, he says nothing of Christ's descent into Hades, or Hell: Which was not as yet put into any Creed of the Catholics, except that of *Aquileia.*

*Exclude*

*Exclude the Person of the Son.*] In all the Editions both of St. *Hierom*'s and St. *Austin*'s Works, which I could see, it is *Excludit.* But I guess it is false Printed for *includit, induit, accipit,* or some such Word. c. Year after the Apostles 317.

*Holy Spirit instead of Seed.*] I do not remember any Sect that held this. *Tertullian* had, in an allusive way of speaking, said, (41) *Being the Son of God from the Seed, that is, the Spirit of God his Father, Flesh without the Seed of Man was to be taken by him that he might be the Son of Man. For the Seed of any Man was not proper for him who had the Seed of God:* And St. *Hilary* (42) in the same way of speaking had called it, *The Seminative power of the Spirit coming on her.* But *Pelagius* seems to aim at some Person or Persons then living. In one of my Copies it is, *Ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur.* But in that elder one that I mention'd, it is, *Ut quidam sceleratissimè opinatur.* I am afraid St. *Hierom* might have somewhere said some such thing by way of allusion, for *Pelagius*'s chief spite was at him. But I do not remember it. d. (41) De carne Christi, c. 18. (42) Lib. 2. de Trinitate.

*Or, in Soul, or in Mind.*] The words are, *Vel in animâ, vel in sensu.* But they must be intended for the Translation of ψυχὴ and νοῦς, for *Apollinaris* said, that Christ's Humane Nature had ψυχὴν but not νοῦν. e.

*Sin, which is not natural to us.*] He takes some advantage of this for his Opinion against original Sin. But that which was not natural to Man, as God made him, is become, in some sence, natural, since his depravation. e.

*All things belonging to the Divine Nature, pass into the Man, and* è contra.] He is large against this Impiety; which was held by the *Arians* and the *Apollinarists.* The *Arians* had this aim in teaching it, that by owning the Divine Nature of Christ to have suffer'd, the Christians might fall into their Opinion, that his Divine Nature was not the same with that of God the Father. *Phœbadius* had a little before this written a Tract against the Form of Faith drawn up at *Sirmium,* wherein he mentions (43) an Epistle of *Potamius* the *Arian,* that had disseminated this Doctrine, that the Divinity of Christ had suffer'd. *This you do,* says he, *that People should not believe him born of him who is undoubtedly incapable of suffering.* And *Epiphanius* says the same thing of the *Arians, Hær.* 69. f. 259. (43) Cap. 7.

The

Year after the Apostles 317. The *Eutychians* also ran far into this Notion of the Communication of Properties, but that was a good while after *Pelagius*'s time.

348. As 'tis hard for eager Spirits to keep the mean, it was but ten years after this that *Nestorius* made a very ill use of this same Notion of the Properties of each Nature being incommunicable, to establish an impiety in the other extreme, *viz.* that the λόγος and the Man Christ, are two Persons; under pretence of inveighing against one error he runs into the other. For, speaking of his Adversaries, he says (44), *They make use of the Union of God and Man to establish a confused mixture,* &c. *They speak of God the WORD, who is consubstantial with the Father, as if he had taken the beginning of his origin from the Virgin Mother of Christ; as if he had been built together with his Temple, and buried with his Flesh. They say that the same Flesh did not remain after his Resurrection, but did pass into the nature of the Godhead,* &c. But then he adds, *The Virgin, whom many have ventur'd to call the* Mother of Christ, *they are not afraid to call the* Mother of God.

(44) Ad Celestinum Papam Epist. 1.

There wanted only the accuracy of speaking, which *Pelagius* had here used, to clear and settle that dispute between the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians.* He grants here that the *Son of God* was born, suffered, died, *&c. i. e.* the same Person who is the Son of God; but not in that nature by which he is God, or the Son of God. However, when that feud broke out, the *Pelagian* party join'd their interest with the *Nestorian,* as I shew'd before (45).

(45) §. 25.

g. *In the same truth of our Limbs.*] *In eadem veritate membrorum in quâ nunc sumus.* St. *Hierom* had inveighed against *Rufinus,* and the *Origenists* for denying this, and saying that it would be an Æthereal Body, not of such Limbs as we now have: and he had reflected upon the *Pelagians,* as leaning toward them in many things. But *Rufinus* had renounced any such Opinion; and so does *Pelagius* here.

In the last clause of this Article [*for ever remain such*] he reflects not only on *Origen,* who believed a great many changes in the future state; but on St. *Hierom* who had spoke of Hell torments, as if there were hope that they would not be Eternal.

*With*

*With the same Sacramental words to Infants.*] St. *Hieron* had said, as I repeated before, (46) that they must either own, that Infants are Baptized for *forgiveness of Sins*, or else make two Baptisms. *Pelagius* was therefore forced to say, as he does here. And *Celestius* in his *Draught of his Faith*, which I shall recite presently (47), gives this reason why he grants that Infants are Baptized for forgiveness of Sins, *That we may not seem to make two sorts of Baptism.* Year after the Apostles 317. h. (46) §. 26. (47) §. 31.

St. *Austin* quotes this saying of *Pelagius*, and some others *verbatim* (48) as out of his *Libellus fidei*, and makes some Animadversions on 'em. Which makes it so plain that it is *Pelagius*'s, that no Critic, great, or small, has of late years taken it to be St. *Austin*'s own, except the great Master of that Art, mentioned at §. 2. (48) De gratia Christi, c. 32.

*Restored by Repentance.*] This is against the *Novatians.* In the Copy that is in St. *Austin*'s Works it is said, *Primò per reconciliationem, deinde per pœnitentiam*, 'first 'by Reconciliation [*or, Absolution*] and then by Repen-'tance [*or, penance*]. That Insertion looks like a Monks hand. But the old Edition is as I have translated it. i

*Same number of Books.*] *Rufinus* had then lately published an *Exposition on the Apostle's Creed*, in which he had given a Catalogue of the Books of the Old and New Testament, which the Catholics owned in opposition to the Heretics, exactly agreeing with that of the Protestants, and said, *These are those which the Fathers have ranked within the Canon; and on which they would have our Doctrines of Faith to depend. But it is to be known that there are some other Books which have been called by the Ancients* [not Canonical, but] *Ecclesiastical.* Where he reckons, *Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Macchabees, Hermas* and *Judicium Petri.* Which, he says, the ancient Christians *would have to be read in the Churches; and for other Books, they would not have them read in Churches at all.* k

*Souls made by God.*] This is aim'd against St. *Austin*, who inclin'd to the other Opinion that the Soul is by Propagation; but never positively asserted either side. l

Year after the Apostles 317.

*The Soul not a part of the Substance of God.*] Against the *Manichees* and *Priscillianists.*

m. *Souls sinned in a former state.*] He clears himself from the suspicion of *Origenism* as to that particular: But

n. yet some of his party embraced it, that they might the better account for the Baptism of Infants without owning original Sin.

*Commands of God not performed by one Man, but by all taken together.*] This is the Sentence which Mr. *Le Clerc* cites as if it were St. *Austin*'s, to shew that he contradicts St. *Hierom*; as I mentioned §. 2. And indeed it does not only contradict him, but is levell'd at him as a Blas-

(49) Dial. 1. phemer; for St. *Hierom* writing (49) against that Opinion of *Pelagius*, that a Man may live without Sin, had used a long discourse to shew that those Men that are free from some sort of faults, are subject to other sorts; and that no one Man can have all Vertues; and, among the rest, had used that Sentence which I recited §. 14. *Pelagius* is here in hopes to make Heresie and Blasphemy out of that.

Also, the other Clause of this Paragraph about *condemning Marriage*, is meant against St. *Hierom*, who, in many of his Works, and particularly in those against *Jovinian*, had so excessively commended Virginity, that some of his Expressions were reproachful to the state of Marriage, especially of second Marriages; and he had been forced to write an Apology to explain his meaning.

p. *Did tell lies by necessity of the Flesh, and that because of the Humane Nature which he had assumed, he could not do all things that he would.*] This is a severe Animadversion on St. *Hierom*, who, in the second of the Dialogues which he wrote against *Pelagius*, being eager in shewing the presumption of that Tenet of his, That 'tis possible for a Man to avoid all Sin if he will, had argued thus, *I cannot*, says Christ, *do any thing of my self*, &c. *The* Arians *here raise a Cavil; but the Church answer, that this is spoken in respect of the Humane Nature which he had assumed; you, on the contrary say,* I can be without Sin, if I will. *He can do nothing of himself, that he may shew the truth of Humane Nature. You can avoid all Sin; that you may, even while you are in the Body, set your self forth as a God.*

*He told his Brethren and Kindred that he would not go to the Feast of Tabernacles; and yet it is written afterward,* But when his Brethren were gone up, then he also went up to the Feast. *He said he would not go; and yet afterwards*

*wards did what he denied he would do.* Porphyry *snarls at this, and accuses him of inconstancy and change; not considering that all things that give offence, are to be refer'd to the Flesh* [or, imputed to the Humane Nature.] Year after the Apostles 347.

St. *Hierom* does not however call this a Lye, as *Pelagius* would represent his Words; but an alteration of purpose incident to Humane Nature.

And at another place in the same Dialogue, having quoted that saying of our Saviour, *Father, if it be possible, remove this Cup from me.* He adds, *Why, I pray you, does he use the Words of one that were in doubt? He had said in another place,* The things that are impossible with Men, are possible with God. *But being a Man, and to suffer, he speaks in the Language of a Man. He says,* If it be possible, let one hour pass from me. *You say,* 'tis possible to avoid Sin all one's Life.

Not only *Pelagius* was of Opinion that these sayings were irreverent, and did impute Sin to our Saviour as a Man; but *Theodorus* also Bishop of *Mopsuestia*, who was a *Pelagian* likewise, wrote a Treatise, *Against those that say Men Sin by Nature, and not by their Will.* He calls the Adversary, whom he there expresses by a feigned name, *ARAM*; but he means St. *Hierom. Photius* gives an abstract of the Book (50). And therein *Theodorus* imputes to his Adversary this saying, *That even Christ having assumed the Humane Nature, which is infected with Sin, was not free from Wickedness.* But this is to put a very malicious Interpretation upon St. *Hierom*'s words, which were indeed not very warily spoken.

(50) Biblioth. cod. 177.

The Writer of the first of those two Letters of the *Pelagians*, against which St. *Austin* wrote his *four Books to Pope* Boniface, made afterward the same spiteful reflection, saying of his Adversaries (*i. e.* the Catholics) in general, that they held (among a great many horrid things which he there heaps up) *That Christ was not clear from Sin; but that he told lyes by the necessity of the Flesh, and was stained with other Sins.* To which St. *Austin* there (51) answers, *Let them look to it whom he has heard say such things, or in whose Books he has read something perhaps which he did not understand, and has turn'd to this slanderous Sense by a deceitful malice.* St. *Austin* speaks so, as that one may guess he knew where they had this; but was not willing to enter into a dispute to vindicate St. *Hierom*'s Words.

(51) Lib. 1. ad Bonifac. c. 2.

Year after the Apostles 317.

The 18 *Pelagian* Bishops had this over again in their Letter to the Bishop of *Thessalonica*, as we may see by St. *Austin*'s second Book to *Boniface*, *c.* 6. And *Julian* again, as appears by St. *Austin*'s answer to him, *L.* 3. *C.* 6.

St. *Hierom* at many other places owns in plain words, that our Saviour had no Sin; and therefore this spiteful advantage ought not to be taken of his words in this one place. Even in these very Dialogues, *Dial.* 2. having shew'd that all that are mere Men have some failings, he adds; *To have all things, and to be wanting in nothing, is peculiar to the Vertue of him,* who did no Sin, neither was any guile found in his Mouth.

St. *Hierom* had moreover in the third of these Dialogues cited a place in the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, where Christ is brought in speaking thus, *What Sin have I committed that I should go and be Baptiz'd of* John, *unless this that I have spoken be a Sin of ignorance*? But he does not pretend there that this Book is Authentical, or to be credited. And yet the *Pelagians* afterward objected this to him, as if he had by this Quotation gone about to establish *a fifth Gospel, which taught that Christ did Sin.*

q. *And that we shall there have Virtues which we took no care to have here.*] St. *Hierom* had not said so, but he had said something which *Pelagius* would draw to that sense.

(52) Dial. 1. He had said (52), *So long as we have this treasure in earthen vessels, and are encompass'd with frail and mortal and contemptible Flesh, we think our selves happy if in some single Vertues, or parts of Vertue, we do service to God. But when this corruptible shall be clothed on with incorruption, and Death shall be swallowed up in the Victory of Christ, then God will be all things in all Men: So that* Solomon *will have not only the Grace of Wisdom,* David *of Meekness,* &c. *and each two or three Vertues; but all will be in each, and the whole number of Saints shall triumph in the whole Chorus of Virtues.* Tho' these words, give no sufficient ground for this Calumny, yet the *Pelagians* ceased not to inculcate their Accusation of the Doctrine of the Catholics upon occasion taken from them. *Julian* and the 17 Bishops harped upon the same string. For we find St. *Austin* answering 'em thus (53) *Who can bear it, when they object to us as if we did say that after the Resurrection there will be such a proficiency, that* Men shall there begin to keep those Commands of God, which they refused to keep here; *And all this because we say that there will be there no Sin at all, nor any conflict*

(53) Lib. 3. ad Bonifac. c. 7.

*conflict with the Concupiscence of Sin? As if they themselves did dare to deny this.*

Year after the Apostles 317.

*We do always stand in need of God's help.*] St. *Austin* quotes this Sentence (54), and then says, *Here again we would know what sort of help he owns us to stand in need of, and again we find him ambiguous; for he may say, that he means, the Law and Christian Doctrine, by which our natural power is helped,* &c.

r.

(54) De gratiâ Christi, c. 33.

§. 30. Together with this Confession of his Faith, *Pelagius* sent a Letter to *Innocent*, Apologizing for himself, and endeavouring to shew that he did not in all points hold as his Adversaries gave out, and to justifie what he did hold. He was very desirous to continue in the Catholic Church, and not be separated from it. He used great art in reciting the Articles objected against him, so as that he could easily answer 'em or deny 'em; and in wording his own Opinion so as he could easily defend 'em. The Letter is lost, except such parts of it as St. *Austin* has preserved, by quoting 'em as he had occasion to write Animadversions on 'em. I shall recite only that passage of St. *Austin*, where he quotes that part of the Letter which speaks of the Baptism of Infants, which is this,

*Augustin. de peccato originali, c.* 17, 18, &c.

*Observe how* Pelagius *attempted slily to deceive even the Episcopal Judgment of the Apostolic See in this very question of the Baptism of Infants. For in the Letter which he sent to* Rome *to holy* Pope Innocent *of blessed Memory, which finding him not in the Body, was deliver'd to holy* Pope Zosimus, *and by him transmitted to us, he says,*

'*SE ab hominibus infamari quòd neget parvulis baptismi sacramentum, & absque redemptione Christi aliquibus regna cœlorum promittat.* That Men do slander 'him as if he denied the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants, and did promise the Kingdom of Heaven to any 'Persons without the Redemption of Christ.

*But these things are not so objected to them as he has set 'em down. For they do not deny the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants, neither do they promise the Kingdom of Heaven to any without the Redemption of Christ. So that the thing*

Year after the Apostles 317.

*he complains he is slander'd in, he has set down so as that he might easily answer to the Crime objected, and yet keep his Opinion. But the thing that is objected to them is this, that they will not own that unbaptized Infants are liable to the Condemnation of the first Man, and that there has passed upon 'em original Sin, which is to be cleansed by Regeneration; but do contend that they are to be baptized only for their receiving the Kingdom of Heaven,* &c. ——— *And then mark how he answers, and mind his lurking holes of Ambiguity,* &c. *For, having said,*

'*Nunquam se vel impium aliquem hæreticum audisse, 'qui hoc quod propesuit de parvulis, diceret:* [That he never 'heard, no not even any impious Heretic or, Sectary,] 'who would say that (which he had mentioned) of Infants.

*He then goes on, and says,*

'*Quis enim ita Evangelicæ lectionis ignarus est, qui hoc 'non modo affirmare conetur, sed qui vel leviter dicere aut cogitam sentire possit? Denique quis tam impius, qui parvulos 'exortes regni cœlorum esse velit, dum eos baptizari & in 'Christo renasci vetat?* For who is there so ignorant of 'that which is read in the Gospel, as (I need not say to 'affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, 'or even to have such a thought? In a word, who can be 'so impious as to hinder Infants from being Baptiz'd 'and Born again in Christ, and so make 'em miss of the 'Kingdom of Heaven?

*All this talk is nothing to his purpose. He does not clear himself by this. That Infants without Baptism cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, is a thing which they themselves never denied. But that is not the question. The question is about the cleansing of original Sin in Infants: Let him clear himself on that point. He will not own that the laver of Regeneration has any thing which it need wash off in Infants; and let us see what he says next. After reciting that Testimony of the Gospel, that*

'None can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, that is 'not born again of Water and the Holy Spirit.

*About which there is, as I said, no question; he goes on, and says,*

'Who is there so impious as to refuse to an Infant of 'what Age soever the common Redemption of Man-'kind?

*This*

*This too is ambiguous, what Redemption he means: whether from a bad estate to a good one; or from a good one to a better. For* Celestius *did own in his Book at* Carthage, *the Redemption of Infants; and yet would not own that Sin did pass from* Adam *on them.* But mind his next words, Year after the Apostles 317.

'And to hinder him that is born to an uncertain Life, 'from being born again to an everlasting and certain 'one:

S. *Austin* is something long in conjecturing what he means by these last words; but he pitches on this, that as *Pelagius* would not own Children to be by nature in a state of Condemnation, and on the other side granted that they were not born in a state to go to Heaven; so he would not determine so positively as some of his Abetors did, that they should have an eternal Life out of the Kingdom of Heaven; but left it as an *uncertain* thing what should become of 'em; and therefore said, that they were *born to an uncertain Life*, but that if they were Baptiz'd they would have an *everlasting Life*, and that *certainly* in Heaven. And he quotes on this occasion that saying of his which I mention'd before, *For unbaptiz'd Infants, I know whither they do not go; but whither they do go, I know not.* And this Phrase of his, *Vitam incertam*, is much the same with that which I recited of S. *Ambrose* (55) *Opertam illam pœnarum immunitatem*, 'That state of Freedom from Punishment, which is not 'clear. (55) CH. XIII. §. 2.

The chief thing I observe in this Letter is the Confession of *Pelagius*, that he had never heard, no not even any Sectary, deny the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants. For the Words of the Letter, if we put together the Paragraphs which stand disjoined in this Animadversion of St. *Austin* on 'em were thus,

*Men slander me as if I denied the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants, or did promise the Kingdom of Heaven to some Persons without the Redemption of Christ; which is a thing that I never heard, no not even any wicked Heretic, say. Or who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the Gospel, as (I need not say to affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even have such a thought? In a word who can be so impious as to hinder Infants from being Baptiz'd and born again in Christ, and so make 'em miss of the Kingdom of Heaven; since our Saviour has said, that none can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven that is not born again of Water and the Holy Spirit? Who is there*

Year after the Apostles 317.

*so impious as to refuse to an Infant of what Age soever the common Redemption of Mankind, and to hinder him that is born to an uncertain Life from being born again to an everlasting and certain one?*

§. 31. The Creed, or Book of Faith, which *Celestius* presented, is no where extant. St. *Austin* has recited some parts of it, which shew plain enough that it differ'd from that of *Pelagius.* I will mention one passage which he recites, (56) which is to our purpose.

(56) De peccato originali, c. 5.

*Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum secundùm regulam universalis Ecclesiæ, & secundùm Evangelii sententiam confitemur; quia Dominus statuit regnum cœlorum non nisi baptizatis posse conferri; quod quia vires naturæ non habent, conferre necesse est per gratiæ libertatem. In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandæ infantes non idcirco diximus, ut peccatum ex traduce firmare videamur; quod longè à Catholico sensu alienum est. Quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodùm exercetur ab homine: Quia non naturæ delictum, sed voluntatis esse demonstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum; ne diversa baptismatis genera facere videamur: Et hoc præmunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occasionem, ad Creatoris injuriam, malum antequam fiat ab homine radicetur homini per naturam.*

'We own that Infants ought according to the *Rule of* 'the *Universal Church,* and according to the *Sentence of* 'the *Gospel,* to be Baptiz'd for *forgiveness of Sins,* because 'our Lord has determined that *the Kingdom of Haven* 'cannot be conferred upon any but baptiz'd *Persons*; which 'because it is a thing that Nature cannot give, 'tis needful to give it by the liberty of Grace. But when we 'say that Infants are to be Baptiz'd *for forgiveness of Sins,* 'we do not say it with such intent as that we would seem 'to confirm the Opinion of Sin being by derivation [*or,* 'propagation] which is a thing far from the Catholick 'Sense. For Sin is not born with a Man, which is afterward acted by Man; because it is demonstrable that 'Sin is a thing, not of Nature, but of Choice. Therefore it is both proper to own the former, that we may not 'seem to make two sorts of Baptism; and also necessary 'to give a caution about the latter, lest on occasion of 'the Sacrament it be, to the reproach of the Creator, said, 'that evil is by nature conveyed to a Man before it be 'acted by him.

§. 32.

§. 32. The Argument he gives against original Sin is as good an one as could be given in so few Words. But to grant that Infants ought to be Baptiz'd *for forgiveness of Sins*, and yet to maintain that they had no Sin, was perfect *Irish*. Year after the Apostles 317.

*Pelagius* express'd himself more silly in his Creed: He said that Infants are to be Baptiz'd with *the same words as elder Persons are.* St. *Austin* excepts against that (57), and says, *'Tis Things that we regard and not Words only.* But beside, *Pelagius* did not nigh so plainly or openly in his Creed to *Innocent* deny original Sin, tho' he had in other Books.

(57) De gratia Christi, c. 32.

But at last *Pelagius* swallowed this morsel too; for *Pinianus*, *Albina* and *Melania*, do certifie St. *Austin* that upon their importunity us'd with *Pelagius* to renounce the Opinions for which he was censur'd, he had in their hearing said, *Infantes in remissionem peccatorum percipere baptismum*: 'That Infants do receive Baptism for remission of Sins. St. *Austin* answers (58), That *that is indeed more than he had said in his* Libellus; *for now he does not say*, with the Words of forgiveness, *but confesses that they are Baptiz'd* for forgiveness it self. *And yet if you should ask him what Sin he thinks is forgiven 'em, he would maintain that they had none at all. Who could think that under so plain a Confession a contrary Sense could lie hid, if* Celestius *had not belted it out*? &c. 319.

(58) Ibidem.

They that would maintain a Dispute, or Theological Wrastle, and would not take this for a fair Fall or Baffle, it could be no longer worth the while to contend with 'em. *Pelagius* had had at the Council of *Diospolis* some silly sayings objected to him out of a Book; and when he denied the Book to be his, they ask'd him, Whether since he disown'd those sayings, he would anathematize those that said such things? He answer'd, handsomely enough; *I anathematize 'em for Fools, not for Heretics; for there is no Article of Faith spoken of in 'em.* But now he himself, when he is driven to this plunge as to grant that Infants are Baptiz'd for pardon of Sins, and yet have no Sin, will seem to all Readers to deserve the first of those Anathematisms, if not the last.

But the way by which his partners went about to make sense of this odd saying, we have in a Letter of St. *Austin* to *Sixtus* (59), written a good while after these times. There S. *Austin* having said of the *Pelagians*, that they are so *Circumstipati & Divinarum auctoritate lectionum, & Antiquitus*

(59) Epist. 105.

Year after the Apostles 317 *tiquitùs tradito & retento firmo Ecclesiæ ritu in baptismate parvulorum*, 'befet both with the Authority of God's 'Word and with the usage of the Church that was of 'old deliver'd to it, and has been since kept by it, in the 'baptizing of Children, That they dare not deny that Infants are Baptiz'd for *forgiveness of Sin*; and, that it must not be suppos'd that the Church does this *fallaciter, in any trickish or deceitful meaning*; but, *ut fide agatur quod agitur, utique fit quod dicitur*; 'Since what is acted, 'is acted seriously, that which is spoken must be supposed 'to be really done. He adds,

*That therefore which they have devis'd to say, when this manifest force of truth weigh'd 'em down, what Christian is there that will not laugh to hear, tho' he must own it to be very crafty? For they say that* 'Infants do indeed answer 'truly by the Mouths of those that bring 'em that they '*believe in the forgiveness of Sins*; not that any Sins are 'forgiven to them; but that they believe that in the 'Church, or in Baptism, Sins are forgiven to those that 'have any, not to those that have none. *And so they do not yield that Infants are baptiz'd for forgiveness of Sins in such a Sense as that any Sins are forgiven to them, who, they say, have none; but that they, tho' they be without Sin, yet are baptiz'd with that baptism by which is granted forgiveness of Sins to all that have any.*

There will ever be this difference between a Man of sense, and a thick skull'd Man, that the former, if he find himself gravell'd, will at least have the Modesty to give over talking. *Pelagius*, after he was brought to this Contradiction, kept silence; and we hear no more of him.

But *Celestius* blunder'd thro' all this, and a great deal more, when he was Excommunicated at one place, going to another. And he, after all this, continued to make such a noise in the *Eastern* Parts, that the Heresie which was call'd *Pelagian* in the *West*, was there call'd the *Celestin* Heresie. After several Excommunications in *particular* Churches, he was at last pronounc'd a Heretic in the *General* Council, or meeting of all the *Eastern* and
331. *Western* Bishops at *Ephesus*.

*F. Garner* reckons up 24 Synods, in several parts of the World, held against this error, whereof this of *Ephesus* was the last, and the 22d was at St. *Alban*'s in *Britain* (the year of Christ 429. as Bishop *Usher*, and *Garner* out of him do shew) so that if *Pelagius* lived to
329.

this,

this time, he liv'd to see himself Condemn'd by his own Countrymen. Year after the Apostles 317.

I shall take notice only of two more Artifices that these Men used to stave off Excommunication; and so dismiss 'em.

§. 33. 1. They spoke with words of seeming submission to the Bishops to whom they appeal'd. You see with what a Complement *Pelagius* concludes the *Confession of his Faith* to Pope *Innocent*; and *Celestius* began his to *Zosimus* with one of the like nature: For in the Preface of it there were these Words (60), *That if any mistake have by chance happen'd to me thro' ignorance, as being a Man, it may by your Skill be Corrected:* And when *Zosimus* ask'd him if he would (61) *renounce all those Tenets which had been objected to him formerly by the Deacon* Paulinus, *and would give his assent to the Letters of the Apostolic See, which had been written by his Predecessor of holy memory; he refused to renounce the Articles objected by the Deacon, but he did not dare to oppose the Letters of holy Pope* Innocent. *Nay, he promised to renounce all things which that See did renounce.* This St. *Austin* repeats from the Acts of his Examination.

(60) Aug. de peccato orig. c. 6.

(61) Ibid. cap. 7.

But what do these general words avail, when he, reciting the particulars of his Faith, did, as we see, plainly renounce the Doctrine of original Sin; in an absolute contrariety to the Letters of *Innocent*, to which he pretended to submit.

Yet as all Men have a weak side on which they receive Flatterers, this verbal compliance took so far with *Zosimus*, that he undertook the Patronage of these Men against the *African* Bishops; and wrote several Letters in their behalf, and continued so long to hold on their 318. side till at last he found it too hot to hold any longer; and then when he saw they were Condemn'd by the *Council of Carthage*, and by the *Emperor*, and would be Condemn'd by the Christian World, whether he would or no; he himself wrote an *Encyclical Epistle*, as zealous in their Condemnation as he had been before in their Defence; a part of which I shall presently recite.

This made *Julian* and the other following *Pelagians* say (62), *That Pope* Zosimus *and the rest of the Clergy of* Rome *were Turn-coats.* Indeed he acted so as to make it plainly appear, that the infallibility of that See is a gift that has been bestow'd upon 'em since that time: For, mind the particulars.

(62) August. ad Bonifac. lib. 2. c. 3.

1. Pope

Year after the Apostles 317.

1. Pope *Innocent* had by his Letters dated in *January* 417. which I mentioned (63) before, fully and plainly Condemned the Doctrine that denies original Sin; and had Condemn'd *Pelagius* and *Celestius* unless they did recant.

317. (63) §. 28.

317. 2. Pope *Zosimus* some time in the Summer of the same year, upon *Celestius*'s Application to him, *sate on a day of hearing in St.* Clement's Church, &c. ——— *and caused* Celestius's Libellus *which he had given in* [this is the same *Libellus fidei*, or Creed, of which I just now cited a part, denying original Sin] *to be read over.* And he writes a Letter to the *African* Bishops, that he had done so (which is his third Epistle, extant *Tom.* 1. *Conciliorum*) wherein he blames them as having been *too hasty* in censuring *Pelagius* and *Celestius*, and sends a Copy of *Celestius*'s *Libellus* to them, and orders thus; *Either within two Months let some body come that may convict him to his Face, of holding other Opinions than he has set down in his Books and Confession; or else after such plain and manifest Declarations made by him, let your Holiness know that there is no doubt remaining, viz.* but that he is to be acquitted.

317. (64) Zosimi Epist. quarta Tom. 1. Conciliorum.

3. A little while after, *viz. September* 21st he writes another Letter to them (64), that he now had received *Pelagius*'s Letter and *Libellus* likewise; and a Letter from *Praylus*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, in his behalf. That *these had been publickly read over*; and that *the Contents of them were all to the same purpose, sense and tenor with what* Celestius *had produced before. Oh, Brethren! that any of you had been present at the reading of 'em. What joy there was of the Holy Men that were present?* ——— *Some could scarce forbear weeping*, tales etiam [l. tam] absolutæ fidei infamari potuisse, *that it should be possible for such Men of so unrebukable a Faith to be slander'd.* ——— Then he inveighs against their Accusers, and at last says, *If the Father rejoyced at the return of his Son that had been dead, and was alive again, had been lost, and was found*, &c. *How much greater rejoycing of our Faith is this, that these Men, of whom false Stories were reported, never were dead nor lost? I have sent therefore to your Charity Copies of the Writings which* Pelagius *sent*, &c.

317. 4. *Zosimus* declar'd that *Libellus* of *Celestius* (in which he says, as I rehearsed before, that *the Opinion of Sin being* ex traduce, *by derivation or propagation, is far from the Catholic*

*Catholic Sense*) to be Catholic, or Orthodox. This will appear by the next Quotation. Year after the Apostles 317.

5. The *African* Bishops wrote (65) answer to *Zosimus* the latter end of this year, wherein they plead, *That* Celestius *ought to clear himself at another rate than that of saying in general, that he would assent to the Letters of Pope* Innocent. *That he ought to be compelled to recite and condemn those ill things which he had put in his* Libellus, *lest if he did not do that, a great many Persons of weak Judgments might be more ready to think that those Doctrines, poysonous to our Faith, which were in his* Libellus, *were approved by the Apostolic See, because that See had said that that* Libellus *was Catholic; than they would be to think them Corrected by it, because he said he would assent to Pope* Innocent's *Letter.* And the next year the same Bishops in a fuller meeting send him another Letter to the same purpose, but more peremptory; wherein, without any more staying for his consent, or joining with 'em, they determine that *Pelagius* and *Celestius* are to be accounted Excommunicate, till they do recant, *&c.* The Letter, some part of it, is recited out of *Prosper*, above at §. 15. 317. (65) August. ad Bonifa. lib. 2. cap. 3, 4.

6. Then at last, when the Emperor also had declar'd to the same purpose, *Zosimus* himself likewise Condemned these Men, and the Opinions they held against original Sin, as well as the rest of the World did, and his own Predecessor had done; and sent, as I said, an Encyclical or Circular Letter about to the Churches, declaring his Excommunication of 'em. A part of it is recited by St. *Austin*, in (66) these words, *Our Lord is faithful in his words, and his Baptism has the same plenitude* [or, force] *in deed that it has in words; I mean, in its operation, in the owning the true forgiveness of Sins, in all Sexes, Ages, and Conditions of Mankind. For none is made free, but who was a servant of Sin; nor can any be said to be redeemed, but who was before truly a captive by Sin; as it is written,* If the Son do make you free, you shall be free indeed: *For by him we are spiritually regenerated, by him we are Crucified to the World; by his death that bond, contracted by propagation, of death brought upon us all by* Adam, *and transmitted to every Soul, is cancell'd; and there is not any one of all that are born, but what is bound and liable to that bond, until he be by Baptism freed from it.* Here he sings the same tune with his Predecessors, thanks to the *African* Bishops. 318. (66) Epist. 157. ad Optatum.

And

Year after the Apostles 418.

And the Church of *Rome* from that time has been very zealous in the same Doctrine, till now in this last Age they are grown great Latitudinarians in this matter. The *Jesuits* have of late set themselves strongly to overthrow St. *Austin*'s Doctrine of Prædestination; and, not content with that, have push'd their Arguments so far as to undermine the Doctrine of original Sin. And the Court of *Rome* shews so much favour to their Endeavours, that it is probable they would (if they could avoid the slur that would thereby be brought on their Infallibility) once more declare for *Pelagius*.

It seems that a Book of Cardinal *Sfondrata*, which denies the propagation of original Sin, and any punishment of unbaptized Infants, finds so much favour, that tho' several *French* Bishops demanded Judgment of the Pope against it, they could obtain none. On the contrary *Innocent* XII. recommended the Printing of it; and there was lately Printed an Address to the Assembly of *French* Bishops, *anno* 1700. that they would Censure it; but without any success that I have heard of. The Title whereof is *Augustiniana Ecclesiæ Romanæ doctrina*, &c. The Book I have not seen, but an Abstract of it in the common Prints from *Holland*. It shews, it seems, that *such a Book as* the aforesaid, *gives occasion to the Heretics to say, That* Rome *is turning* Pelagian.

*Zosimus* might have been fallible in the case of *Pelagius* himself, and might have been excus'd, because he in great measure conceal'd his Opinion in his *Letter* and *Libellus*; so the mistake might be only in matter of Fact. But *Celestius's Libellus* spoke open enough, and yet he declar'd it Catholic, and that not as a private Man, but sitting in Judicature on a day of hearing in St. *Clement*'s Church. And *F. Garner* grants, and even proves, (67) by good reasons, that this was done in a Synod.

(67) Dissert. de Synodis in causâ Pelagianâ.

§. 34. St. *Austin* endeavours to throw a Cloak over the nakedness of this Pope; For when the *Pelagians* afterward claimed him as theirs, and said, he must be so, or else he must be owned to have declar'd contrary to himself, and urged the Letters aforesaid, St. *Austin* pleads (68),

(68) Ad Bonifac. lib. 2. c. 3.

1. That *Zosimus* did not in any of his Letters deny original Sin. True, but he declar'd that *Libellus* of *Celestius* to be Catholic, which did openly deny it to his Face.

2. (69)

2. (69) That *Zosimus* urged *Celestius* to assent to the Letters of Pope *Innocent*; which Letters maintain'd the true Doctrine. This indeed shews that *Zosimus* did not perceive a plain Contradiction when it came in his way. Year after the Apostles 318. (69) Ibid. c. 4.

3. He takes a charitable advantage of those words in the Preface of *Celestius*, *That if any mistake have happen'd to me*, &c. *it may by your Skill be Corrected*, and says, (70) *Whereas* Celestius *put this* [denial of original Sin] *into his* Libellus, *only among those things of which he owned himself as yet to doubt and to desire to be instructed; it was the desire of instruction (in a Man of good Wit, who if he had been reform'd, might have done a great deal of good) that was approved, and not his false Doctrine. And in that sense his* Libellus *was pronounced Catholic; because this is the part of a Catholic Mind, if it has any Opinions contrary to the truth, not to define them positively, but to renounce them when they appear to be such.* (70) C. 3.

We must commend St. *Austin*'s Charity both to *Zosimus* and *Celestius*. But, as *Vossius* and Bishop *Usher* observe, he that reads *Zosimus*'s Letters will see that for a long time he defended *Celestius*, not as one that was in an error, and was willing to be taught better; but as one that was in no error, but had approved himself to have *absolutam fidem* (as he in his third and fourth Epistle calls it) a Faith absolved from all blame. So that, how favourable an account soever St. *Austin* gives of this matter, *Facundus* tells it thus, (71) Zosimus, *contrary to the Sentence of* Innocent *his Predecessor, commended the Faith of* Pelagius *and of his Partner* Celestius, *and blamed the Bishops of* Africa *for counting him a Heretic.* (71) L. 7. c. 3. 440.

One thing indeed St. *Austin* there says, which is a good answer to the *Pelagians*, who accus'd the Church of *Rome* of changing sides and prevaricating in their Doctrine when *Zosimus* turn'd against them, *viz.* that if *Zosimus* did ever declare *for* them and their Doctrine, that rather ought to be accounted the prevarication; *For*, (72) says he, *when in Reverend* Innocent's *Letters, which say that Infants, if they be not baptized in Christ, will remain in eternal death, the ancient Catholic Faith is set forth; he certainly ought to be accounted the* Turn-coat *of the* Roman *Church, that should have deviated from that Sentence: Which by God's mercy was not done.* (72) Ad Bonifac. l. 2. c. 4.

§. 35.

Year after the Apostles 318.

§. 35. Another thing that *Pelagius* and *Celestius* pleaded, was, that supposing they were mistaken in their Opinion that there is no original Sin; yet this ought not to be accounted Heresie, nor to deserve Excommunication. It was no Article of our Faith to hold one way or the other; it was but one of the questions of lesser moment.

(73) Ibid. c. 22, 23, 24.

*For* Celestius, says St. *Austin*, (73) *spoke in the Ecclesiical Acts at* Carthage *after this manner*, 'I told you before concerning the derivation of Sin, that I have heard 'several in the Catholic Church deny it, and some I 'have heard affirm it. It is a matter of Controversie, 'not of Heresie. As for Infants, I always said that they 'stand in need of Baptism, and that they are to be 'Baptiz'd. What would he have more? *He spoke this with an intent to signifie, that if he had denied that Infants ought to be baptiz'd, then indeed it might have been judged Heresie; but now that he confesses that they are to be Baptiz'd, tho' he give not the true reason of their Baptism; yet he supposes he does not err in a matter of Faith, and therefore is not to be accounted a Heretic.*

*Also in the* Libellus *which he gave in at* Rome, *when he had spoke as much as he pleas'd in declaring his Faith from the Trinity of one Deity down to the Resurrection of the dead, concerning which matters no Body ever demanded or objected anything to him; when he comes to the matter in hand; he says*, 'And if any *questions* have arisen which many 'People dispute about; I have not determin'd any thing 'by a definitive Authority, as if I would be the Author 'of any *dogma* [or, Article of Faith], But I offer those 'things which I have Collected from the fountain of 'the Prophets and Apostles to be tried by the Judg'ment of your Apostleship, *&c. You see his purpose of this prefacing is, that if he be found in a mistake, he may seem not to mistake in the Faith, but in some* questions *that are beside the Faith*, &c.——— *But he is much out of the way in thinking so. These questions which he thinks to be beside the Faith, are of a very different Nature from those in which one may be ignorant, or mistake without hurt to the Faith, as for example, if a question be put*, Where the Garden of Paradise is, *&c. But in the concerns of those two Men, by the first of whom we are sold under Sin, and by the other redeemed from Sin*, &c. *the Christian Faith does properly consist.*

And

And afterward: (74) *Therefore whosoever does maintain that humane nature, in any Age whatever, does not stand in need of the second* Adam *for a Physician, as not being defiled in the first* Adam; *this Man's mistake is not in a question in which one may doubt or err without hurt to the Faith, but he is Convicted as an enemy of God's Grace by the very rule of Faith, by which we are Christians.* Year after the Apostles 318. (74) Ibid. c. 29.

§. 36. The most material thing to our purpose to be observ'd from these passages of the latter part of this History, is this, how exceedingly the *Pelagians* were press'd with this Argument taken from the Baptism of Infants; and to how many absurdities they were driven in answering of it. Sometimes they said they were not Baptiz'd for forgiveness, but for something else. Sometimes they owned they were Baptiz'd for forgiveness, not that they had any Sin, but that the uniformity of the words might be kept; or because they were Baptiz'd into the Church, where forgiveness was to be had for those that wanted it; or, because they were Baptiz'd with a Sacrament which had the means of forgiveness for any that had sinned, or should sin. And some flew to that, that Infants have Sin; tho' not by propagation from a sinful stock; but either before they were born, in a former state, or since they were born by peevishness, *&c.* Since these Men resolved not to own original Sin in Infants, how much had it been for their turn to deny that they were to be Baptiz'd at all? If they had known of any Church or Society of Christians, then in being, or, that ever had been, that had disowned Infant Baptism; their interest would have led 'em to alledge their example, or to plead it in their own behalf. But far from that, *Celestius* does own that Infants are to be Baptized according to the *Rule of the Universal Church*; and *Pelagius* moreover confesses (the same thing in effect that St. *Austin* in another place urges) that *he never had heard, no not even any impious Heretic or Sectary, that denied Infants Baptism*; and that *he thought there could not be any one so ignorant as to imagine that Infants could enter the Kingdom of Heaven without it.* You have their words before, §. 29, 30.

And if there had been any such Church of Antipædobaptists in the World; these two Men could not have mist an opportunity of hearing of 'em, being so great Travellers as they were: For they were born and bred, the one here in *Britain*, the other in *Ireland*. They liv'd the

Year after the Apostles 318.

prime of their Age (*diutissimè*, a very long time, as St. *Austin* (75) testifies) at *Rome*, a place to which all the People of the World had then a resort. They were both for some time at *Carthage* in *Africa*. Then the one settled at *Jerusalem*, and the other travell'd thro' all the noted *Greek* and *Eastern* Churches in *Europe* and *Asia*. It is impossible there should have been any Church that had any singular practice in this matter, but they must have heard of 'em. So that one may fairly conclude that there was not at this time, nor in the Memory of the Men of this time, any Christian Society that denied Baptism to Infants. This cuts off at once all the pretences which some Antipædobaptists would raise from certain probabilities, that the *Novatians*, or *Donatists*, or the *British* Church of those times, or any other whom *Pelagius* must needs know, did deny it. I shall however, more particularly consider those probabilities at another place (76).

(75) De peccato originali, c. 21.

(76) Part. 2. CH. IV.

§. 37. Besides the passages I have here recited of this Controversie, St. *Austin* wrote a great many more, which I must omit, because the reciting of 'em all would make a large Volume of it self. Several whole Books, and many long Epistles he wrote to several Men against the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, where he always makes use of the Argument taken from the constant use of the Church in Baptizing Infants, to prove it to be the general sense that they have original Sin.

I will only give the names of some of 'em, that they that have a mind to read more of this matter, may have recourse to 'em, if they please.

*Augustini ad Valerium de nuptiis & concupiscentiâ.* Two Books.

*Ad Bonifacium contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum.* Four Books.

*Enchiridion.* One Book.

*De Gratiâ & Libero arbitrio.* One Book.

*De correptione & gratiâ.* One Book.

*De prædestinatione Sanctorum.* One Book.

*De dono Perseverantiæ.* One Book.

*Contra Julianum Pelagianum.* Six Books compleat, and other Six left imperfect.

*De Gestis Palæstinis.* One Book.

*De octo Dulcitii quæstionibus.* One Book.

*Comment.*

*Comment in Psalm* 51. 'I was shapen in Iniquity, *&c.* Year after the Apostles 318.

*Sermo* 10. *it.* 14. *de verbis Apostoli. it. in Sancti Johannis nativitatem.*

Letters to *Paulinus*, to *Optatus*, to *Sixtus*, to *Celestinus*, to *Vitalis*, to *Valentinus* and several others.

All these I pass over, saving that, as I have already here and there fetch'd in some passages of 'em; I shall at the end of this Chapter recite two or three that will shew how the state of this Controversie stood between St. *Austin* and *Julian* some years after *Pelagius* had been Condemn'd and given over disputing.

But first, I must give an account of a *Canon* of the Council of *Carthage* held *Anno* 418. about this matter, which is one of the eight that have formerly by a vulgar error been attributed to the Council of *Milevis*, held *Anno* 416, whereas the Council of *Milevis* did only write their Sentence in a Synodical Letter to *Innocent*; which Letter, together with that of the Council of *Carthage* of the same year I recited before (77). That was in the year 416. And the next year 417 there was another meeting of the Bishops at *Carthage*, of which nothing is extant, save that it appears by some passages of St. *Austin* recited before, §. 33. and some others recited §. 15. that they declared that they could not acquiesce in that Judgment which Pope *Zosimus* had passed in favour of *Celestius*, of which they advertised *Zosimus* by their Letter. 318. (77) §. 28.

But the next year after, *viz.* 418. there was a full Assembly at *Carthage* of the Bishops of all the Provinces of *Africa*, 214 in number. Then it was that they sent that *peremptory* Letter to *Zosimus*, which I spake of. And then also they passed eight Canons against the *Pelagian* Tenets.

In the second they mention the Baptism of Infants, condemning two errors about it: One of those who thought that an Infant must upon no account be Baptiz'd before he be 8 days old. I shew'd before, (78) that one *Fidus*, a Bishop near *Carthage* had held so 150 years before, and it seems some People were still of that Opinion; the other, of those that held that absurd Opinion (which *Pelagius* and *Celestius* had made their last refuge) that Infants are Baptized for forgiveness of Sins, and yet have no Sin. The Canon is this. (78) CH. VI. §. 1.

Year after the Apostles 318.

## *Concilii Carthag. anno* 418. *Canon secundus.*

318. *Item placuit ut quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat; aut dicit in remissionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari, sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati quod lavacro regenerationis expietur (unde sit consequens ut in eis forma baptismatis in remissionem peccatorum non vera sed falsa intelligatur) Anathema sit. Quoniam non aliter intelligendum est quod ait Apostolus,* Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum & per peccatum mors, & ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt: *Nisi quemadmodum Ecclesia Catholica ubique diffusa semper intellexit. Propter hanc enim regulam fidei, etiam parvuli qui nihil peccatorum in seipsis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in peccatorum remissionem veraciter baptizantur, ut in eis regeneratione mundetur quod generatione traxerant.* ———

'Also we determine that whosoever does deny that 'Infants may be Baptized when they come fresh from 'their Mothers Womb; or does say, that they are in-'deed Baptized for forgiveness of Sins, and yet that they 'derive no original Sin from *Adam* (from whence it would 'follow that the form of *Baptism for forgiveness of Sins* 'is in them not true, but false) let him be Anathe-'ma. For that saying of the Apostle, *By one Man Sin 'enter'd into the World, and Death by Sin; and so Death 'passed upon all Men, for that* [*or, in whom*] *all have sin-'ned*; is to be understood in no other sense than as the 'Catholic Church spread over all the World, has always 'understood it. For, by this rule of Faith, even Infants, 'who have not yet been capable of committing any Sins 'in their own Persons, are in a true sense Baptized for 'forgiveness of Sins, that in them what was derived by 'Generation may be cleansed by Regeneration. ———

Here this Canon ends in most Copies, but in some there is a farther clause against such as allow an eternal Life in happiness to unbaptized Infants, tho' not in the Kingdom of Heaven: I shall have occasion to recite that Clause, and my Opinion about it in the next Chapter.

The Reader will without any Admonition perceive the mistake of those Men, who speak of this Canon as if Infant Baptism were establish'd by it as a thing that had been questioned, or was then newly brought into use,

use. It appears with plainness more than enough, that as well the makers of this Canon, as they against whom it was made, did both of 'em look on the thing it self as undoubted; they differ'd about some of the reasons or effects of it only. Year after the Apostles 318.

But *Grotius* did very unkindly give an occasion to vulgar ignorant People to run into this mistake by that saying of his recited *CH. VI.* §. 4. That *there is in the Councils no earlier mention of Infant Baptism than in the Council of* Carthage, meaning this, or that two years before. Whereas he himself knew well enough, that beside the other passages in Authors, and beside the Councils I mention'd in *CH. XVI.* it is mention'd in one of the first Councils of which we have any good account since the Apostles time, as I shewed in the foresaid VI. Chapter.

§.38. *Pelagius* and *Celestius* being thus Condemn'd, and the Bishops that would not subscribe to their Condemnation being depriv'd, which were 18 in number in all the *Western* Empire; they made Remonstrances, and sent about into the *East* to several places, but found no Countenance. Yet *Julian*, who had been Bishop of *Eclanum* in *Italy*, and was the best Penman among 'em, maintain'd the Dispute with St. *Austin* for some years; each of 'em writing 12 Books one against the other. And St. *Austin* died while he was writing the last six. 330.

If they had said any thing new in reference to our Subject, it had been necessary to relate it; but there being nothing new, I shall only recite two or three passages to shew that they spoke about Infant Baptism in the same Tenor as before.

After the Condemnation one of the *Pelagian* party sent a Letter to some of the Clergy at *Rome*, hoping to retrieve an interest there. St. *Austin* thought it was written by *Julian*, and answer'd it as his. But *Julian* disowned it, and St. *Austin* was content they should ascribe it to which of their Sect they pleas'd. In it they say many things to clear themselves; and, among the rest, this, which is recited by St. *Austin* (79), *We do acknowledge that the Grace of Christ is necessary for all, both grown Persons and Infants; and we renounce all that should say that one that is born of Parents both baptiz'd ought not to be baptiz'd.* And so in the Letter which all the eighteen of 'em subscribed and sent to the East, *We own Baptism to be necessary for all Ages* (80). 320.

(79) Lib. 1. ad Bonifac. c. 22.

(80) Apud August. l. 2. ad Bonifac. c. 25.

Year after the Apostles 318. To which St. *Austin* answers (81), *What does it signific that they do own Baptism to be necessary for all Ages (which the* Manichees *hold is needless for any Age) so long as they suppose it has no effect in Infants for the* forgiveness of Sin?

(81) L. 4. ad Bonifac. c. 4.

321. And speaking to *Julian* himself (82), *As to the question of Baptism, about which you complain that there is a great odium rais'd against you among ignorant People by our Lyes, 'tis strange how neatly you come off; you clear your self of this odium by owning that* 'Infants are to be baptiz'd, because, '*you say*, the Grace of Baptism is not to be alter'd for the 'Causes [or, Subjects] of it; since it dispenses its Gifts 'according to the Capacity of those who come to it. And 'so Christ, who is the Redeemer of his own Workman-'ship, does by a continued Bounty encrease his Benefits 'toward his Image; and those whom he had made *good* at 'first, he makes *better* by renewing and adopting 'em.

(82) L. 3. adverf. Julian, c. 3.

*Is this all you have to say why there should be no odium rais'd on you about the Baptism of Infants? As if any of us had said that you deny that Infants ought to be baptiz'd? You do not say that they ought not to be baptiz'd; but according to your great Wisdom you say certain strange things. You say,* 'they are baptiz'd in the Sacrament of the Savi-'our; but yet they are not saved from any thing. They are 'redeemed by it, *you say*, and yet they are not deliver'd 'from any thing by it.

And at the end of the Chapter, *They are strange things that you say; they are new things that you say; they are false things that you say; as strange, we are amaz'd at 'em; as new, we are shy of 'em; as false, we confute 'em.*

And again, *Cap.* 5. having produced a great many proofs that Infants have need of the Grace of Christ for acquitting them from the Guilt of a corrupted Nature, he says to *Julian*,

*If you would come to be of this mind, you would own the Grace of Christ toward Infants in its true and natural sense. And you would not be put to those shifts, to say things impious and absurd; either that Infants are not to be baptiz'd, which perhaps you will hereafter say; or that so great a Sacrament is in their case such a mockery, as that they are baptiz'd in a Saviour, but not sav'd from any thing; that they are wash'd in the laver of Regeneration, but have nothing wash'd off in it,* &c. *And all this, because you are afraid to say, they should not be baptiz'd; lest not only the Man should spit in*

*your*

*your feces, but the Women also should throw their sandals at your heads.* Year after the Apostles 318.

In the sixth Book, *cap.* 3. he puts *Julian* in mind of his own Baptism in Infancy, and how ungrateful a thing it is for him to disown the forgiveness of Sin, that was granted to him therein; *Your good Father*, says he, [St. *Austin* had been acquainted with his Father] *ran with you, little thinking how ungrateful you would be for that mercy.* 286.

Tho' St. *Austin* does over and over again tell the *Pelagians*, that no Body accus'd 'em of denying Baptism to Infants; yet it is probable 'twas him himself they meant to have raised that *odium* against 'em among the vulgar. For he speaks here and at other places, as if he thought they had a great mind to deny it, if they could have had the face. He had formerly in a Sermon (83), (which he had preach'd against 'em, and which was publish'd) after many things said to prove that Infants have Sin, and that it is for that that they are baptiz'd, added this, *Nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit: Hoc à majorum fide percepit; hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit, quoniam non est opus sanis medicus*, &c. 'Therefore let no Body whisper (*or, insinuate*] 'any strange Doctrines to you. This the Church has al-'ways had, and ever held; this it has receiv'd from the 'Faith of its Ancients, and this it keeps constantly to 'the end, that the whole have no need of a Physici-'an, *&c.* What need then has an Infant, if he be not 'sick, *&c.*

(83) Serm. 10. de verbis Apostoli.

But whoever it were that had rais'd this report, *Julian* was so enraged against any that insinuated that he or his party denied, or ever meant to deny it, that he sticks not to Anathematize all that deny it; for so are his words (84), *We are so far from denying it to be profitable to all Ages, that we allot an eternal Anathema to those that say it is not necessary even for Infants.*

(84) Apud Augustinum, Operis imperfecti, lib. 1. c. 51.

Yet *Marius Mercator* would needs have it that their inward sense was against it, only to keep up their credit with Christians they in Words and Declarations own'd it. This he goes about to prove by Consequences from their other Doctrines (85), and then says, *So that 'tis plain you must think that they need not be baptized, only you imp se upon us in your* words, *but in your heart you hold the impiety of* Jews *and Heathens.* This was hard, when they made such Protestations to the contrary; he had no other reason than that it would best have fitted with their other

(85) Subnotationum in scripta Juliani, c. 8.

Year after the Apostles 321. Doctrines. But *Mercator* wrote his Tract 10 years after this of *Julian*, so that it could not be him that *Julian* meant.

331. §. 39. *Theodorus*, who was at this time Bishop of *Mopsuestia* in *Cilicia*, was in this question of the mind of the *Western Pelagians*. And *Julian*, when he was deprived, retir'd to him. Some will have it, that he was elder in this Sentiment than *Pelagius* himself. It might be so, for 292. 328. he was Bishop from the year 392 to 428. However that be, he seems to have conceal'd this, as well as some other Heterodox Tenets he had, all his Life time; they were discover'd afterward by some Writings he left. He had such singular Opinions, especially about the Authority of some Books of Scripture, that he was, after his Death, Condemn'd in some General Councils for a Heretic in greater points than this. This Condemnation of him shews the weakness of the Argument of a Modern Writer (86) who would prove that the Canon of Scripture was not settled in the Church at this time, because he rejected some Books of it. He shews that he did that, forgetting to tell us that he was therefore Condemn'd as a Heretic.

(86) Mr. *Bassage*.

As for the Book he wrote on the *Pelagian* side, there is a particular reason to conclude that it did not come abroad in the World till after St. *Hierom* and St. *Austin* were dead, because they never take any notice of it, tho' it be aim'd chiefly against them two without mentioning their Names.

758. This Book is not now extant, but an abstract of it is given by *Photius* (87). If it be lawful to take a Quotation at second hand from any Author, later than our Period, it is from *Photius*; he was Patriarch of *Constantinople*, *Anno* 858, and the Collections of so Learned and Judicious a Man are valued almost as much as if we had the Originals.

(87) Bibl. Cod. 177.

The Title of the Book was, *Against them that say Men Sin by Nature, and not by Will.* There are particular Reflections plain enough upon the two Fathers I mentioned. But one of the Opinions he there ascribes to his Adversaries as an absurd one, is, *That Infants, even when they are new-born, are not without Sin, because our Nature being by* Adam's *Fall become sinful, that sinful Nature is deriv'd to all his Posterity.* And one of the Arguments he makes them use to prove it, is this, *For what reason are the Holy Mysteries given to Infants? Why are they accounted worthy of Bap-*

*Baptism* [*or, proper to be baptiz'd*] *but because they are full of Sin, Sin being implanted in their Nature? For it is for forgiveness that these things are done to them.*

Year after the Apostles 321.

The answer that he gives, is, as *Photius* observes, the oddest that ever was given. He does not deny that they are baptized for forgiveness. But he says there is one sort of forgiveness which is for Sins past; and another to procure a state for us in which we shall no more Sin. And that is given, partly in this Life, and *perfectly* (as *Photius* recites his words) *in that Restauration which is to be after the Resurrection; for the obtaining of which both we, and also new-born Infants are baptized.* He gave himself a great Latitude in the use of Words, to call that *forgiveness.*

I mention this Man, only to shew that he, as well as the *Pelagians* of the *West*, took it for granted that Infants are to be baptiz'd, tho' he thought they have no Sin. And even as for that Opinion against Original Sin, (whatever he thought or kept in Writing by him) he found it necessary for him to join with the Neighbouring Bishops, in a Synod held there, to Condemn *Julian* and his Opinions; as we understand by *Mercator* (88).

(88) Præfat. in Symbolum Theodori.

§. 40. After this time, the *Pelagian* Opinions being so universally Condemn'd, none but some very few and very desperate Persons did venture to declare for them, or against original Sin. But a considerable Number did still oppose another Opinion that St. *Austin* held about particular Prædestination. These were called by their Adversaries *Semipelagians*, tho' they expresly renounc'd *Pelagius* as a Heretic. And they call'd their Adversaries *Prædestinarians.* But as to the matter we are treating of they all agreed, That there is original Sin in Infants: That all baptiz'd Infants dying in Infancy are saved; and, that no Infant dying without Baptism goes to Heaven.

The difference between them, as to the case of Infants that die in Infancy was this; St. *Austin* and his Followers held that God, by his mere gratuitous Pleasure, does ordain that such or such Infants shall come to have Baptism, and so be saved, and others shall miss of it; without any regard had to the Qualifications, which they would have had if they had lived.

But the *Semipelagians* (so called) said, that such Infants as God foresaw would have been faithful Christians if they had liv'd, those he by his Providence procur'd to be baptiz'd; and suffer'd others to miss of it.

So

Year after the Apoſtles 321. So both agreed that in both Caſes Salvation attends Baptiſm.

344. 407. 324. This appears at large in the works of *Proſper*, *Fulgentius*, *Caſſian* and others of each Party, and in the latter Works of St. *Auſtin* himſelf; wherein he labours to expoſe his Adverſaries Opinion as abſurd, ſince God, who in Scripture is ſaid to judge every one *according to what they have done*, is brought in by theſe Men as judging Infants by what they did not do, but would have done, if they had lived. And they anſwer'd, that this is more reaſonable than to judge without any conſideration at all.

He objects, that according to their Hypotheſis it is to little purpoſe which is ſaid in the *Book of Wiſdom* (89), of one that dies young, *He was taken away, leſt wickedneſs ſhould alter his underſtanding*, &c. if God will judge him according to what he would have done. To which they anſwer, that that is not *Canonical* Scripture; and he does not go about to maintain that it is.

(89) CH. IV. v. 11.

I ſhall have occaſion to produce ſome of their ſayings hereafter (90), (where I give ſome account of the Opinion of the Anciants, concerning the future ſtate of Infants dying unbaptiz'd) and therefore omit them here.

(90) Pt. 2. CH. VI. §. 4.

323. 332. 340. 414. In this diſpute the Popes and Clergy of *Rome* were generally zealous for the *Prædeſtinarian* ſide, as *Celeſtin*, *Sixtus*, *Leo*, *Hormiſdas*, *&c.* The other ſide found moſt Abetters in *France*, eſpecially about *Marſeilles*.

CHAP.

# CHAP. XX.

## *Quotations out of* St. Austin *and* Vincentius Victor.

THere were no need of quoting any more out of St. *Austin*, either of the Doctrine that he held, or of the testimony that he gives of the Churches practice in his time or before, were it not that this *Vincentius*, saying some new things about the Case of Infants that had never been said before, gave occasion to St. *Austin* also, who answer'd him, to insist on some new proofs and defences of the Catholic Doctrine.

*Vincentius* seems to have been so inconsiderable a Person, that his Name would not have been remembred to the next Generation, if he had not ventur'd to write against St *Austin*; which now by the Books which that Father vouchsafed to write in answer to him, which are four Books, intitl'd, *Of the Soul and its Origin*, is likely to be spoken of as long as the World lasts.

He was a young Layman, remarkable for two things, Malapertness in judging and determining of Controversial Points; and a certain Bombast in his Style, which St. *Austin* (1), out of his wonted Civility and Condescension, allows to be Eloquent; and would make him believe, he might, if he would use his Parts well, do God much service.

(1) Lib. 1 de animâ & ejus origine, c. 2, 3.

He was lately come off from the Schism of the *Donatists*, which about this time moulder'd away; but being of a restless Head, could scarce keep clear of the Heresie of the *Pelagians*, which had been (at the time when St. *Austin* wrote his first Book against him) newly Condemn'd. For so are St. *Austin*'s words (2), *Juxta Pelagianam hæresin, olim damnabilem, nuperrimeque damnatam.* 'According to the *Pelagian* Heresie, which 'always deserv'd Condemnation, and is just now Con'demn'd.

(2) Ibid. c. 19.

I take

Year after the Apostles 319. I take notice of this last Circumstance, to set the time of this dispute right; for inasmuch as the year 418 was (as Bishop *Usher* expresses it) the fatal year for the *Pelagian* Heresie (for it was in that year that the Canons of the forementioned great Council of *Carthage* were publish'd on *May* the first. And the Imperial Edicts on *April* 30. And Pope *Zosimus*'s Circular Letter a little after) this Book of St. *Austin's* must probably have been written the latter end of that year, or the beginning of the next.

318. 319.

I shall by and by make some use of this Observation about the year, in explaining a passage which will give some light to this Observation, and receive some from it.

§. 2. *Vincentius* wrote two Books, chiefly against that Opinion (to which St. *Austin* inclined) that the Soul is by Propagation. He owned (3) original Sin, which was the most material point in which he differ'd from the *Pelagians*. The Soul, he said, is a corporeal Substance (4); and so is the Spirit (which he took to be different from the Soul): On which St. *Austin* observes, that according to him a Man consists of three Bodies. But he granted that God is of an incorporeal nature; on which St. *Austin* says (5), *I am glad that in that point however he keeps free from the dotages of* Tertullian. It is to be noted that *Tertullian* said, that God also is a Body, or else he would be nothing at all.

(3) Ibid. c. 9.

(4) Ibid. c. 5.

(5) Lib. 2. c. 5.

When he came to speak of that question, whether the Soul be propagated from the Parent to the Child, or be by immediate Creation; he determin'd, that it is immediately Created, and withal, express'd a great Contempt of the dulness and ignorance of those that did at all doubt or demurr on that question. And he reflected on St. *Austin* particularly and by name, as one that had confess'd his inability to resolve it, because of that Objection: How consist with God's Justice to put a Soul that is not deriv'd from *Adam*, but is created pure, into the Body of an Infant, where it immediately contracts guilt and defilement.

We saw before (6) how much St. *Austin* was puzzled with this Objection; and how St. *Hierom* being desir'd by him, had refus'd to meddle with the solution of it. But now here *Vincentius* undertakes easily to answer it. But St. *Austin* shews that unless he could have brought a more skilful answer, he were better have demurr'd too; and

(6) CH. XV. Sect. 6. & 7.

*were*

*were better have confess'd his Ignorance than betray'd his Folly.* Year after the Apostles 319.

The answer he had given was this,

1. First, in respect to such Infants as do by God's Providence come to have Baptism; that (7) *they being by God's prescience prædestinated to eternal Life, it does 'em no hurt to continue a little while under the guilt of another's Sin.* That *as the Soul contracts a Disease by sinful Flesh, so Sanctification* [*viz.* that of Baptism] *is likewise convey'd to it by means of the Flesh; so that as by it the Soul lost its merit,* [or, innocence] *by it also it recovers its state.* (8) *For shall we think that because it is the Body that is washed in Baptism, that* [benefit] *which is believed to be given by Baptism, is not conveyed to the Soul or Spirit? Fitly therefore it does by the Flesh recover its former disposition which by the Flesh it had seemed for a while to have lost; that it may begin to be regenerated by that by which it had been defiled: So* (9) *that tho' the Soul, which could have no Sin of its own, did deserve* [or, had the fate] *to be made sinful, yet it did not continue in a state of Sin,* &c.

(7) Apud Augustin. lib. 1 de Animâ & ejus origin. c. 8.

(8) Lib. 3. c. 7.

(9) Ib. c. 8

Against this answer S. *Austin* objects, that if we examine it strictly, it makes God first do an ill thing in bringing an innocent Soul into a Sinful Condition, and then make amends for it a little after by the Grace of Baptism: *Avertat* (10) *autem Deus, & omninò absit, ut dicamus quando lavacro regenerationis Deus mundat animas parvulorum, tunc eum mala sua corrigere,* &c. 'But God forbid, and 'far be it from us that we should say, that God, when he 'cleanses the Souls of Infants by the washing of Rege-'ration, does then make amends for his own Faults, &c. However, he says this is something; and may, after a fashion, serve for such Infants as do come to be Baptiz'd. *De his* (11) *quidem parvulis invenit qualitercunque quod diceret,* &c. 'He has found something to answer after 'a fashion for such Infants.

(10) L. 1. c. 7.

(11) L. 1. c. 8.

But the chief difficulty is about those that miss of Baptism; of whom we are to see in the next place what *Vincentius* said.

2. In reference to such as are never baptiz'd, he, in his first Book (for he wrote two, as I said) determin'd thus (12), *Habendam dicimus de infantibus istiusmodi rationem, qui prædestinati baptismo vitæ præsentis, antequam renascantur in Christo, præveniuntur occiduo, &c.* —— *Ausim dicere istos pervenire posse ad originalium indulgentiam peccatorum; non tamen ut cæleste inducantur in regnum. Sicut latroni*

(12) Apud August. l. 2. de Animâ, &c. c. 9, 10.

Year after the Apostles 319.

*latroni confesso quidem, sed non baptizato, Dominus non cœlorum regnum tribuit sed paradisum; cum utique jam maneret, &c.*

'We must give some account of those Infants which 'being designed to be baptiz'd in their life time, are, be- 'fore they be regenerated in Christ, prevented with death. '-----I may venture to say that they may obtain for- 'givenes of their original Sins; and yet not be admitted 'to the Kingdom of Heaven. As our Lord granted to 'the Thief, that owned him and was not baptiz'd, not 'the Kingdom of Heaven but *Paradise*; that Sentence 'being in force; *He that is not born again of Water and the Holy Spirit, shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Especially when our Lord says, that his Father has* many Mansions; *by which are meant the many and different merits* [or, rewards] *of those that shall dwell in 'em. So that there both the unbaptized may be admitted to pardon, and the baptiz'd to the Crown which is procur'd by the Grace.*

*For such Infants indeed I give my Opinion, that there be offer'd for them daily Oblations, and continual Sacrifices of holy Priests. This I prove to be fitting to be done, by the example of the* (13) Macchabees *that fell in the battle,* &c.

(13) 2 Macchab. 12.

On which determination of his, St. *Austin*, in the next words, makes this remark, *Cernis hominem, paradisum atque mansiones quæ sunt apud Patrem, à regno separare cœlorum; ut etiam non baptizatis abundent loca sempiternæ felicitatis, &c.* 'You see how the Man, that he may 'find places of eternal Happiness for such as are not bap- 'riz'd, is fain to separate Paradise, and the Mansions in 'God's House from the Kingdom of Heaven.

And a little after, *How can he hope that he himself shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, from which Kingdom he excludes the House of the King himself to what distance he pleases?* And in the third Book written to *Vincentius* himself, he observes (14), *Christ does not say, as you cite his words,* My Father has many Mansions; *and if he had said so, they could not be understood to be any where but in his Father's House. But he says expresly* (15), in my Father's House are many Mansions.

(14) Cap. 11.

(15) John 14. 2.

And having, a little after, observ'd also that our Lord does not say (16), *If any one be not born again of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* But, *he cannot enter into the Kingdom of* God. He then concludes, *So I suppose you may by this time under-*

(16) John 3. 3, 5.

*stand*

*ſtand how wide from truth it is to ſeparate any Manſions in the* Houſe of God *from the* Kingdom of God. Year after the Apoſtles 319.

To the inſtance that *Vincentius* gives of the Thief who went to Paradiſe, tho' not baptiz'd, as he ſuppoſed, St. *Auſtin* anſwers (17), ſhewing how extraordinary his caſe was. That he owning Chriſt at that time when they were putting both Chriſt and him to death, may well go for a Martyr baptiz'd in his own Blood; that St. *Cyprian* reckons him as ſuch; that moreover we are not ſure but that he had been baptiz'd, *&c.* and concludes, *Verum hæc ut volet quiſque accipiat, dum tamen de baptiſmo non præſcribatur Salvatoris præcepto hujus latronis exemplo: Et non baptizatis parvulis nemo promittat inter damnationem regnumque cœlorum quietis vel felicitatis cujuſlibet atque ubilibet quaſi medium locum.* (17) Lib. 1. c. 9.

'But of theſe let every one take which he pleaſes, al-
'ways provided that the example of this Thief be not
'made uſe of for a preſcription againſt our Saviour's
'rule concerning Baptiſm, and that no Man do promiſe
'to unbaptiz'd Infants, a place of reſt and happineſs of
'any ſort, or any where, as a kind of middle place be-
'tween Condemnation and the Kingdom of Heaven.

But *Vincentius* in his ſecond Book went farther: For there, having reaſſumed the inſtance of the Thief, and of one *Dinocrates* (a Boy that died at ſeven year old; and a Siſter of his that ſurvived and ſuffer'd Martyrdom, named *Perpetua*, had, while ſhe lay in Priſon, a Dream or Viſion, wherein ſhe ſaw him in a place of darkneſs and miſery; and afterward having pray'd for his Soul, ſhe had another Viſion or Dream, wherein ſhe ſaw him in a place of happineſs. This was recorded in a Hiſtory (18) that was then 200 year old, and is ſtill extant) he ſays of the Thief, and of this *Dinocrates* (who he ſuppoſes died unbaptized, becauſe born of Heathen Parents, as the Story ſhews) that they, for all their want of Baptiſm obtain'd Paradiſe; and then adds (19), *Or if any one do contend that the Soul of the Thief, or of* Dinocrates *were placed in Paradiſe only for a time, and that they ſhall have at the Reſurrection the reward of the Kingdom of Heaven; altho' that principal Sentence,* He that is not born again of Water, *&c. be againſt this, yet he ſhall have my willing aſſent, if this do more ſet forth the effect of the Divine mercy and preſcience, and our love of them;* ſhewing hereby as St. *Auſtin* takes it, his Opinion to be that unbap- 100. (18) Paſſio Sanctæ Perpetuæ & Felicitatis. (19) Apud Auguſt. lib. 2. de Animâ &c. c. 12.

Year after the Apostles 319.

unbaptiz'd Infants also may, after staying some time in Paradise, attain at the Resurrection to the Kingdom of Heaven.

On which St. *Austin* says, *Is it possible for any one to shew greater boldness, rashness, presumption of error in this matter? He remembers our Lord's Sentence, he repeats it, he sets it down in his Book; he says,* Although that principal Sentence, &c. be against this; *and yet he dares exalt the neck [or, pride] of his own Opinion against the principal Sentence.——I intreat you, Brother, consider, whoever gives assent to any thing against the Authority of the principal Sentence, what Sentence he deserves at the hands of the Prince.* And, at another place (20) *You don't consider how much worse you hold in this matter than* Pelagius; *for he, standing in awe of our Lord's Sentence, by which unbaptized Persons are not permitted to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, does not dare send Infants [viz. unbaptized ones] thither, though he think them free from all Sin.*

(20) L. 3. c. 13.

But St. *Austin* does here something stretch *Vincentius*'s Words: For he does not speak this expresly of Infants, but of the Thief and *Dinocrates*; and of them but doubtfully.

(21) L. 1. c. 10

As to *Dinocrates*, St. *Austin* answers (21),

1. That the Book that tells this Story, is no Canonical Book.

2. That *Perpetua*, or whosoever wrote it, does not say that he died unbaptized. For that being seven years old, he might have been baptiz'd by the procurement of some Body else, or by his own choice, tho' his Father were a Heathen.

And he might have answer'd farther (as Bishop *Fell* does (22) to some Papists that build the belief of Purgatory, and the duty of praying Souls out of it on this Story) that here is no other Evidence of *Dinocrates* being removed from Torment to Happiness, than a Dream of *Perpetua*, who, as the Bishop shews, by some Circumstances, was probably a *Montanist*; and they were a Sect that attributed more to their Dreams and Revelations than to the Scripture. Nor does any Author before *Vincentius* quote this Book but *Tertullian*, who was himself a *Montanist*,

(22) Notis in Passionem Perpetuæ, &c Edit. Oxon. 1680.

St. *Au-*

St. *Austin* shews also that *Vincentius* is the first that ever advis'd the Prayers of the Church to be us'd for any that had died unbaptized, or for any but Church-Members. They had then, and so they had in *Tertullian*'s (22) and *Cyprian*'s time, a custom of Commemorating at the receiving of the Eucharist, the names of the Faithful deceased, and of making some general Prayers for them, such as, *God rest their Souls and grant 'em a happy Resurrection*; but nothing like those Prayers which the Papists make for Souls supposed to be in Purgatory; nor did they use 'em for any but Baptized and Faithful Christians. Therefore whereas *Vincentius* advises these Prayers to be us'd as an after remedy for such Infants as had died without being partakers of Baptism: St. *Austin* on this account says (23), *Do not believe, nor say, nor teach, that the Sacrifice of Christians is to be offer'd for such as die unbaptized, if you will be a Catholic. For neither do you shew that that Sacrifice of the Jews which you mention out of the Books of the* Maccabees *was offer'd for such as died uncircumcised. In which your Opinion so new, and set up against the Authority of the whole Church*, &c.

Year after the Apostles 319.

(22) Tertull. de Monogam. pro animâ ejus orat, & refrigerium, &c.

(23) L. 3. c. 12.

§. 4. I have recited these passages the larger, and in *Vincentius*'s own words, because there has been lately a hot dispute between Colonel *Danvers* an Antipædobaptist, on one side, and Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Wills* on the other, whether this *Vincentius* denied Infant Baptism. You may judge by what I have rehearsed of *Vincentius*'s own words, that the Colonel undertook a hard task. Yet he maintain'd his Post a great while, referring the Reader for proof to *Austin* and *Tho. Waldensis*, which latter lived but about 300 years ago. But his Antagonists searching and reciting the places to which he had referr'd, made it plain, that neither of 'em had said any other thing of *Vincentius*'s Opinions than what is to the same purpose with that which I have here recited from himself. This had been enough to damp the Courage of an ordinary Man; but he being thus home-charged, and not used to yield, said at last (24), *He denied it, as the denial of Infant Baptism went in those days*, viz. *that Children might be saved without it.* The sense of which words, if they have any, is this, That no Body in those days denied Infant Baptism any otherwise than by saying that Children might be sav'd

1309.

(24) Second Reply, p. 37.

Year after the Apostles 319.

without it; which is to yield the whole matter in dispute about the practice of those times, for fear of seeming to yield in one particular.

The truth of the matter is, that if we except *Tertullian* (whose words I shewed before to be ambiguous and inconsistent) this *Vincentius* is the first Man upon Record that ever said that Children might be saved without Baptism; if by being saved we mean going to Heaven, for that many before him thought they would be in a state without punishment, I have shewed before.

§. 5. *Vincentius* does not speak positively neither, and that which he did say, he, sometime after he had received these Books of St. *Austin* wrote against him, recanted. This St. *Austin* lets us know in the *Review* of his own Works, written seven years after this time (25). For there speaking of these Books which he had wrote in answer to *Vincentius*, he adds, *Which young Man I treated with all the Mildness possible, as one that was not hastily to be detested, but to be as yet instructed; and I received from him Writings in answer, containing his recantation.*

(25) Retractat. l. 2. c. 56.

§. 6. Here is a proper place to say something of that Clause, which I said even now (26) is found in some Copies of the Canons of the Council of *Carthage*, *an.* 418. annexed as a part of the second Canon. It is this,

(26) CH. XIX. §. 37.

*Item placuit, ut si quis dicit ideo dixisse Dominum,* In domo Patris mei mansiones multæ sunt, *ut intelligatur, quia in regno cœlorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus ubi beatè vivant parvuli qui sine baptismo ex hâc vitâ migrarunt; sine quo in regno* [*l. regnum*] *cœlorum, quod est vita æterna, intrare non possunt, Anathema sit.*

'Also it has seemed good to us, that if any one 'affirm that our Lord did therefore say, *In my Father's 'House are many Mansions*; that it should be meant, 'that there will be in the Kingdom of Heaven any 'middle place, or any place any where, in which Infants 'may live in blessedness that have died without Bap'tism; without which they cannot enter into the King'dom of Heaven (which is all one as eternal Life) he 'should be Anathema.

Most

Year after the Apostles 319.

Most part of the Copies have not, as I said before, this Clause. But it is found in several. Mr. *du Pin* mentions an old MS. that has it, and says that *Photius* cites it; and that the *Codex* publish'd by *Quesnellus* has it in. Cardinal *Norris* quotes it, but thinks it spurious. And those Antipædobaptists that examin'd *Wills*'s Appeal against *Danvers*, say that they find it in the *Collectio Regia. Tom. 4. pag.* 559. The Critics have not, as I know of, given any account of this difference in the Copies; of which I will here give my Conjecture.

I believe the Canon, as it was first enacted and publish'd (which was as I shewed before in the Council in *May* 418) had not this Clause. But *F. Garner* (27) and Bishop *Usher* before him (28), have plainly shewn that there was in *June* the next year, *viz.* 419, another Council of the Bishops of all the Provinces of *Africa*, in which *the Canons of the former Council were read over and confirmed*; and also as Bishop *Usher* has it) *Some peculiar matter against the* Pelagian *Tenets enacted.* He does not give any guess what that peculiar matter should be: But he proves that there was some such thing, partly from *Prosper*, and partly from this following passage of St. *Austin* in his Letter to *Valentinus* (29). *What was written to Pope* Zosimus *from the* African Council; *and his Letter to the Bishops of all the World*; *and what we did in the following plenary Council of all* Africa, *enact in short against that error.* That plenary Council which he calls the *following one*, and places after *Zosimus*'s Letter, must have been in 419. since I shewed before that that Letter was after the Council in 418.

(27) Differt. de Synodis in causâ Pelagianâ.

(28) Eccles. Brit. Antiq. c. 10. prope finem.

(29) Epist. 47.

I also shewed before, at §. 1. that this new Fansie of *Vincentius* was publish'd and canvass'd in the time that passed between those two Councils, *viz.* in the latter end of the year 418, or in the beginning of the year 419. And it was publish'd *Mauritania Cæsariensis*, one of the *African* Provinces: For there *Vincentius* liv'd, as St. *Austin* tells us (30); and it had some Followers; for he speaks of one *Peter* a Presbyter that among others embraced it.

(30) Retract. l. 2. c. 56.

I believe then that the Canon of 418. had only so much as is in the ordinary Copies; but that the Bishops meeting in 419, and understanding that this Opinion had been, since their last Meeting, vented in one of their Provinces, to support by a new *Sakes* the *Pelagian* Hypothesis, they then added to the second Canon, which spoke of the case of Infants, this Clause.

Year after the Apostles 319.

My chief reason is, because this Addition recites the very words of *Vincentius*, and does condemn 'em in almost the same words which St. *Austin* had us'd in the Confutation of 'em, as will appear to any one that will turn back to §. 2, 3. And the Fansie was so new and uncouth, that no Council could have thought of it, but on such a particular occasion.

And I believe the reason why most Copies of that Council do now want this Clause, is,

1. Because the Canon having been first publish'd without it, many Copies went abroad before that Appendix was added. And,

2. Because the modern Church of *Rome* has set up an Hypothesis so like this of *Vincentius*, and their *limbus infantum* does so nearly resemble his *feigned Paradise*, being as that was, a kind of *middle place*; that those of that Church who had the transcribing of Copies, did not like well of an Anathema denounc'd against such an Opinion.

CHAP.

Year after the Apostles from 67 to 330.

# CHAP. XXI.

*Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, *Philastrius*, St. *Austin* and *Theodoret* who wrote each of 'em Catalogues of all the Sects and Sorts of Christians that they knew or had ever heard of, do none of 'em mention any that denied Infant Baptism, except those who denied all Baptism.

§. . THe Christians have always been of two sorts, *viz.* Catholics, who, tho' they inhabited several Countries, yet did all own Communion one with another, and so made one Catholic Body, or Church; and Sectaries or Heretics, who renounced the Catholic Body aforesaid, and separated into several Parties on account of some Tenets, Opinions, or Practices in Religion, which they held different from the Catholic Church; or sometimes merely on account of some quarrel with the Governors thereof. The Church of Christ never was, nor ever in this World will be so happy as to be without such Sects and Divisions. But woe be to the Men by whom they come.

The Quotations hitherto produced do concern the practice of the Catholics in this matter of Infant Baptism, saving that here and there by the bye there has been mention made of the Tenets of some of the Heretics or Schismatics. As of the *Donatists*, *CH. IX.* §. 1. *CH. XV. Sect.* 4. §. 4. *CH. XVI.* §. 1, 2. And of the *Arians*, *CH. XII.* §. 9, 10. And of the *Pelagians*, *CH. XIX. per totum.* Of all whom it appears that they practis'd Infant Baptism, as the Catholics did, and that without any difference of Opinion concerning the use or effect of it, save that the *Pelagians* held that it was not for the Cure of original Sin, but for other purposes. Also we saw in

Year after the Apostles from 67 to 330.

the said *CH. XIX.* the several Declarations of St. *Austin* at §. 17. pleading, that he had never heard, and of *Pelagius* at §. 30. granting that he also had never heard of any Sect or Sort of Christians that denied Infant Baptism. And that which they two do say there in general, I find to be agreeable to the account that is given by all the rest that write Histories of the several Sects in particular, *viz.* that among all that vast number of Sects, and their several Opinions which they recite, they mention none that denied Baptism to Infants.

They do indeed each of 'em mention some Sects that used no Baptism at all, of which Sects I do give a Catalogue in the second part of this Work (1). St. *Austin* observes they were all of 'em such as disowned also the Scripture, or a great part thereof. But my meaning is, that of all the Sects that own'd any Water Baptism at all, they mention none that denied it to Infants.

(1) CH. V.

Now since they do all of 'em make it their business to rehearse all the Tenets, Opinions and Usages, which these Men held different from the Catholic Party, and yet do mention no difference in this particular; one may conclude that they all of 'em practis'd in this particular as the Catholics did. If the Catholics had not baptiz'd Infants, and the Sectaries had; it would have been noted. And if the Catholics did baptize 'em, and the Sects had not; that also would have been noted. For they recite all that each Sect had singular. And they mention differences of much less moment than this would have been. Now what Evidence there is of the practice of the Catholics in this matter must be left to be judged by him that has read the foregoing Chapters; for the Authors cited in them were all Members of the Catholic Church, save that *Tertullian* afterward revolted from it, and *Pelagius* with his Followers were Excommunicated out of it.

§. 2. The first Treatise concerning *Sects* or *Heresies*, that is extant, was written by *Irenæus*. He, about 20 years after St. *John*'s death, was a hearer of *Polycarp* (S. *John*'s Disciple and Acquaintance) at *Smyrna*; and about Forty Seven years after that, was made Bishop of *Lyons* in *France*; so that having liv'd and convers'd in such distant Countries, and with such Men, he had an opportunity of knowing what Sects there were or had been. He wrote this Tract about the year after the Apostles

20. 67.

death

death 76 or 77, as I shew'd before in *CH. III.* §. 6. He mentions the Sects that arose in the time of the Apostles, and those that had sprung up in the 76 years that had passed since their death.

Year after the Apostles from 67 to 330.

They were all of 'em but a few in Comparison of the number that arose afterward; but a great many considering the time that had then passed. He takes most pains in refuting the *Valentinians*, who, it seems, were most numerous at that time and place. But he says himself that his purpose was to rehearse all that were, or had been; which was easie to do for so short a space.

After much Discourse against the *Valentinians*, he goes to prove that they derived their Opinions, not from Christ or his Apostles, but from the former Heretics which had in the Apostle's time set themselves against the Apostles. These are his words (2),

(2) Lib. 1. c. 19.

*Since then that there is manifold Evidence against all the Sects, and that my purpose is to confute each of 'em according to their several Tenets, I think it proper in the first place to recount from what Fountain and Original they spring.*

Then he declares how *Simon*, the Magician, mentioned by St. *Luke* (3), was the first, who, after he was rejected by the Apostles, set up a Sect, and taught that this World was made, not by the good and supreme God, but by inferior and evil Powers; and proceeds in the following Chapters to shew that this impious Tenet made a main part in the Doctrine, not only of the *Valentinians*, against whom he was principally engag'd, but also of most of those Elder ones that had followed *Simon*'s example in setting up Sects. For the same thing was taught by *Menander*, *Saturninus*, *Basilides*, *Carpocrates*, *Cerinthus*, *Cerdo* and *Marcion*, as well as by *Valentinus*. And so it was, after *Irenæus*'s time, by *Manes* and the *Manichees*.

(3) Acts 8. 9.

Of these Heretics mention'd by him, the two first, *Simon* and *Menander* do seem to have endeavour'd to obliterate the Memory of *Jesus Christ*; for each of them pretended himself to be (4) *that great power of God* [*viz.* of the supreme God] that was to redeem Men from the Malice and Tyranny of that Angel, or inferior God that made the World, and gave the Law.

In the Apostles time.

(4) Irenæus, l. 1. c. 20, 21.

In the Apostles time.

The two next, *Saturninus* and *Basilides* owned *Jesus Christ* that came in *Judea*; but they owned only his Divine Nature (5). For they said he was not really a Man, nor did really die, but only in appearance.

(5) Ibid. c. 22, 23.

The two next, *Carpocrates* and *Cerinthus*, (6) owned him to be a Man and a Saviour; but not to be God, nor to have had any being before his humane Birth; only, they said, a Divine Power from the Supreme God came down at a certain time upon him, and dwelt in him, which enabled him to do what he did: This last Opinion is now going to be reviv'd.

(6) Ibid. c. 24, 25.

All these three branches of Heresie arose while St. *John* was alive, and so did the *Ebionites* and *Nicolaitans*, which he mentions (7) likewise. These did not join in the foresaid Blasphemy against the Creator of the World. But had other abominable Tenets. The *Nicolaitans* chiefly in reference to practice, allowing Fornication, *&c.* And the *Ebionites* in point of Faith, disbelieving the Divinity of our Saviour, (as the *Cerinthians* and *Carpocratians*) and renouncing and railing at the Apostle *Paul*, and all his Writings, which do now make one half, and at that time made the much greatest part of the Scriptures of the New Testament, for St. *John* had not written when they set up their Sect. This would make one stand amaz'd at the Impiety of those Men now a-days, that calling themselves Christians, would yet perswade us that these *Ebionites* were the true Christians of those times, that they were the Orthodox, and those whom we call Catholics, were Erroneous. The tendency of such a Tenet is to perswade us, together with the Doctrine of Christ's Divinity to renounce also half the Books of the New Testament. As St. *John* liv'd to see all these Heresies vented, so one may perceive that he at several places of his Writings opposes himself to such Opinions.

(7) Iren. l. 1. c. 26, 27.

Of Sects that had arisen after the death of the Apostles, he mentions (8) the *Encratites*, the *Caians*, the Sects of *Cerdo*, of *Marcion*, and of *Valentinus*. The four last of these were an off-spring of those first mentioned (who were by a general name call'd *Gnostics*) and did all agree with them in the point aforementioned, That the Maker of Heaven and Earth is not the supreme God; but that there is another far above him; and that it was that upper one that sent the Saviour.

(8) Ibid. c. 28, 29, 30, 35.

It

It was in opposition to this sort of Heretics that the Catholic Church found it necessary to insert that Clause, THE MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH, into the first Article of the Creed. For the most Ancient Creeds had no more in that Article than, *I believe in God the Father Almighty.* The *Eastern* Church, where those Heresies were most rife, inserted it first; and the *Latins* from them. The *Latins* had it not in their Creed at the year 400. Without that Clause, the *Manichees, Gnostics, &c.* would say they believ'd in God the Father Almighty; but would mean a quite different God from him whom the Christians own'd, who always meant the Creator of the World, and Author of the Old Testament to be the same with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the Apostles time.

It pleased God by his Providence so to order it, that tho' some Heresies were very Ancient, yet they are all so absurd, that they can tempt no Man of ordinary sincerity that reads the Scriptures.

The points concerning Baptism in which *Irenæus* Notes any of the said Sects to have held any thing singular, are these:

*Menander* promis'd (9) that all that would be Baptiz'd with his Baptism [*or, Baptism in his name*] should presently have a Resurrection, and after that should never Die nor grow Old, but be Immortal. Whereupon *Tertullian*, about 100 years after *Menander*'s death, Challenges (10) that Sect to produce any of their Fellows that had been Baptiz'd by *Menander* himself, that were yet alive.

(9) Ibid. c. 21.

(10) De animâ, c. 50.

The *Carpocratians* Ear-mark'd their Proselytes; and that, as I understand *Irenæus* (11), went for their Baptism. *They burned a hole in the hinder part of the lap of the right ear.* Here let me add a few of the next words, tho' not to this purpose. *They call themselves* Gnostics [i. e. *The Men of knowledge*] *they use also certain Images, some painted, and some carved; and say, they are Pictures of Christ drawn by* Pilate, *while Jesus liv'd among Men: On these they put Garlands, and set 'em up together with the Images of the Philosophers of the World, as* Pythagoras, Plato *and* Aristotle, &c. *And they use all such Ceremonies to 'em as the Heathens do.* These Men, and some People at *Paneas* mentioned by *Eusebius* (12) to have had the like *Heathenish Fancy*, as he calls it, are the first Authors of the worship

(11) L. 1. c. 24.

(12) H. E. l. 7. c. 18.

In the Apostles time.

ship of Christ by an Image, that are any where mentioned.

The *Valentinians* had several under-Sects, of which *Irenæus* speaks particularly; and for their Baptism, he says (13) they had as many sorts of it as there were Teachers among 'em; but all contrary to the true. Some instead of Baptism dress'd up a Marriage-bed, and with certain Prophane words acted a Marriage of the Person to Christ. Others put the Person into the Water indeed, but instead of the Christian Form of Baptism us'd a strange and uncouth one which I have occasion to repeat at another place (14) and anointed the baptiz'd Person with Balsam. *There are some of 'em,* says *Irenæus, who think it needless to bring the Person to the Water at all, but mixing Oyl and Water together they pour it on his head* [by which words of his, and by a thousand other instances it appears that the Catholics did ordinarily put the whole Body into the Water] *and they use certain words not much different from those I mentioned before, and they will have this to be Redemption* [or, Baptism] *and these also use Balsam.* Others of 'em used no Water at all, nor other external Ceremony; but said, spiritual Baptism which consists in the *knowledge of the unspeakable Majesty* is all in all.

(13) L. 1. c. 18.

(14) Pt. 2. CH. V. §. 1.

§. 3. Some of 'em did pour Oyl and Water on the heads of People newly dead, with such Words and Imprecations as he had before mentioned; and they told the dead Man's Soul what it should say, if in its way to the supreme Heaven, it should meet with any of the Principalities or Powers that belong to him that made this World. The Soul was to say, that it was *better than the Power that made them.* And a great deal more such Blasphemous Stuff.

*Irenæus* excuses himself from descending to more particularities: For that they inventing every day new Ways and Opinions, it was endless to describe 'em all.

As to the *Cerinthians* and *Marcionites* he is very short, and says nothing about their Baptism. But *Epiphanius* (15) speaks of a Tradition that the *Cerinthians* did use to Baptize some living Person in the stead of any Friend of theirs that had happen'd to die unbaptiz'd; and that it was in relation to such a practice that the Apostle says (16), *If there be no Resurrection of the*

(15) Hær. 28.

(16) 1 Cor. 15. 29.

*the dead, why are they then baptized for the dead?* And St. *Chrysostom* in his Explication of that Text, says, that the *Marcionites* did the same. And *Tertullian* in his Fifth Book against *Marcion* (17), speaks of that Custom, and the Apostles mentioning of it, but shews that his mentioning it is no Evidence that he approved it. The Comments ascribed to St. *Ambrose*, do also so Interpret the place.

In the Apostles time.

(17) C. 10.

There are two Objections against that Interpretation.

1. One is, that the *Marcionites* for certain, and probably the *Cerinthians* were not in being when that Apostle wrote, *Cerinthus* had a Party before St. *John*'s death; but this Epistle of St *Paul* was a long time before that.

Therefore *Scaliger* and others think that some zealous, but ignorant People, among the Catholics had upon a sense of the necessity of Baptism begun this Custom in St. *Paul*'s time, and that in the Catholic Church it was quickly left off, but that it was continued afterward among the *Cerinthians* and *Marcionites*.

2. The other is, that St. *Paul* would not probably draw an Argument for the Resurrection of the dead from so weak a Topic as the practice either of abominable Heretics or mistaken Christians.

But these Men do not seem to have minded that S. *Paul* does sometimes take in the suffrages even of Heathen Men in his arguings. He might reasonably enough propose to himself to shame those among the Christians at *Corinth* that did not believe the Resurrection, by instancing in the general assent that was given to that Article among all Christians, and even among those who how much soever they might be mistaken in thinking that that Vicarious Baptism would avail the dead, yet did plainly shew that they fully believ'd the Resurrection of the dead, when they practised this sort of Baptism for them.

This Interpretation is certainly the most obvious. And it is something confirm'd by the ill success of those that have attempted any other. That *baptiz'd for the dead* should stand in stead of *baptiz'd for their Bodies* (18). Or that *for the dead* should be Construd *for the state of the dead* (19); or, *for their dead* Adam (20); or, *why are they baptiz'd for the dead? i. e.* Why are Persons ready to

(18) Tertullian contra Marcion. l. 5. c. 10.

(19) Chrysost. in loc.

(20) Vossius de baptismo, Disp 12. th. 2

In the Apostles time.

to die desirous of Baptism *that it may be well with 'em after they are dead* (21)? Or, that ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν should be Translated, *over the dead, i. e.* why do People choose to receive their Baptism at the Tombs of dead Martyrs (22). Or that *baptiz'd for the dead* should mean nothing but *wash'd after the touch of a dead Body* (23). These are the Essays of Learned Men. But the more one observes the Apostle's Phrase, the less probable they appear.

(21) Epiph. Hær. 28.

(22) Pruden. hymn. 8.

(23) Vasquez in tertiam Disp. 157.

The latest that has been given, is, I think, the worst; *Why are they baptized for the dead?* That is, *Why are new Christians baptiz'd every day in the room of those that die?* (24) For that fits neither the Phrase nor the scope of the place.

(24) Mr. Le Clerc. Annot. in loc.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν for ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν (25) *upon the Faith of the Resurrection of the dead*, would fit the sense very well; but it is a great stretch of the words. *Baptized for dead*, i. e. *buried under water for dead*, or, as if they were dead (26), is a mere *Anglicism*, that would never in *Greek* have been express'd by ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν, but ὡσεὶ νεκροί.

(25) Hammond in loc.

(26) Sir Norton Knatchbull.

St. *Chrysostom*'s Objection (27) against this sense of the place, that St. *Paul* should refer to such a Custom among some Christians, is this, *If* Paul *meant so, to what purpose is the threatning of God against one that is not baptiz'd? For if this shift* [*viz.* of a living Person to be baptiz'd for one that is dead] *be admitted, none will ever miss of Baptism; or, if he do, 'twill be the fault of those that survive, and not of the dead Person.* But St. *Chrysostom* does not seem to have consider'd, that (as *Tertullian* says) the Apostle might mention this Custom without approving it. Tho' a mistaken practice, yet it shewed still the Faith of the Resurrection.

(27) In loc.

The *Marcionites* had also several other singular Opinions about Baptism. They would Baptize no married Person till he did Divorce his Wife: For they said that Marriage and all the works thereof were wicked things, and were order'd by that evil God or Angel that gave the Law, and made Mankind. Hence *Tertullian* jeers 'em (28), saying, that they *reserved a Man's Baptism till he was divorc'd or dead.*

(28) Contra Marcionem, l. 4. c. 11.

What *Irenæus* here says of one sort of the *Valentinians* that they baptized some Persons after they were dead, *Philastrius* says (29), was the common Tenet of the *Montanists* or *Cataphrygas*. *Hi mortuos baptizant*, These baptize People

(29) Hær. Cataphrygum.

ple after they are dead. There were also here and there some in the Catholic Church, who, thro' a mistaken Zeal and Compassion to Persons that died unbaptiz'd, would sometimes do the same. For there is a Canon in the third Council of *Carthage* against that practice. That Council allows sick People to be baptiz'd tho' they be speechless, if there be good Evidence of their fitness and desire of it (30). But yet they say (31), *Let not any Priests be so ignorant as to think that dead Persons may be baptiz'd.*

In the Apostles time.

(30) Can. 34.
(31) Canon 6.

Inasmuch as *Irenæus*, among all these Observations, says nothing *pro* or *contra* about baptizing Infants among the Heretics; it may, as I said, be concluded that they had nothing singular in that point, but practis'd as the Catholics did. And for the Catholics, I produced before (32) the saying of *Irenæus* himself, where he speaks of Infants Being, as well as grown Persons, the ordinary Subject of *Regeneration*. And that by *regenerated*, he and all the Ancients did understand *baptized*, whatever Pains might be necessary to shew it then in that Chapter, I suppose there is none needful now; because the Reader has since that seen that all the Authors do speak in that Language.

(32) CH. III. §. 2.

§. 4. The other four, *Epiphanius*, *Philastrius*, *Austin* and *Theodoret* were all living at one time; only *Epiphanius* was the eldest, and *Theodoret* the youngest. I shall not with these take the same Pains as I did with *Irenæus*, of setting down all the Customs or Tenets that they recount the several Sects to have held different from the Catholics, in the matter of Baptism: It would be too Voluminous. 'Tis sufficient that they do none of 'em mention any thing concerning Infant Baptism either as practis'd, or as not practis'd by any of the Sectaries (a plain proof that they held nothing in that point different from the ordinary practice of the Church) save that St. *Austin* notes of the *Pelagians* (which is in his account the 88th and last Heresie that had arisen) that tho' they agreed with the Church that Infants are to be baptiz'd, yet they held a different Opinion concerning the ground or reason of their Baptism; his words are these (33), *Parvulos etiam negant secundùm Adam carnaliter natos contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contrahere. Sic enim eos sine ullo peccati originalis vinculo asserunt nasci, ut prorsus*

From 265. to 350.

(33) Lib. de hæresibus, c. 88.

Year after the Apostles from 365 to 350.

*prorsus non sit quod eis oporteat secundâ nativitate dimitti; sed eos propterea baptizari, ut regeneratione adoptati admittantur ad regnum Dei, &c.*

'They do also deny that Infants which are descend-
'ed from *Adam* according to the Flesh, do, by their
'first Birth, contract any Contagion of the anciently
'threatned death (for they affirm them to be born
'without any bond of original Sin) so that there is no-
'thing in them that needs to be forgiven by the se-
'cond Birth; but that they are baptiz'd for that reason
'that being by this Regeneration adopted, they may
'be admitted to God's Kingdom; being by this re-
'newal advanced from a good state to a better, but
'not absolved from any ill state of the old Obligati-
'on. For, tho' they be not baptized, these Men do
'promise 'em a certain eternal and happy Life; not
'in the Kingdom of God indeed, but of a peculiar
'sort.

This was the only Sect that he knew of, he says (34), that denied Infant Baptism to be for original Sin. And for any that denied it absolutely, he knew of none at all.

(34) See CH. XIX §.

Mr. *Tombs* being to answer Mr. *Marshal*, who had produced a great many of the Fathers that speak of Infants as baptiz'd, makes this Exception, That there are several others of 'em that have nothing at all of that matter. *It is wonder to me*, says he (35), *that if it were so manifest as you speak, you should find nothing in* Eusebius *for it, nor in* Ignatius, *nor in* Clemens Alexandrinus, *nor in* Athanasius, *nor in* Epiphanius.

(35) Examen. pag. 9.

The Objection is but weak; for there is no Age of the Church in which one may not find many Books that say nothing of that matter, because they treat of Subjects on which they have no occasion to speak of that. *Ignatius* wrote nothing but a few Letters to the Neighbouring Churches to exhort 'em to constancy in that time of Persecution. *Athanasius* was wholly taken up about the Trinity. *Clemens Alexandrinus* with the Heathen Philosophers. *Eusebius* writes the Chronicles of the Succession of Kings, Emperors, Bishops and the state of the Church, either flourishing or persecuted, under each of them.

But

But I think Mr. *Tombs* could not well have said a more unlucky thing for his own cause, than to instance in *Epiphanius*: For since he wrote nothing to speak of, but a Catalogue of those Opinions which the several Sectaries held contrary to the Church; to plead, that he says nothing of Infants Baptism, is in effect to give an Argument that there never was any Sect that in that matter practis'd otherwise than the Church did in *Epiphanius*'s time, who died after the year 400. And that the Church at that time used Infant Baptism is so plain that the Antipædobaptists do seldom deny it.

Year after the Apostles from 265 to 350.

300.

§.5. But Mr. *Tombs* gives an instance of a case in which he thinks it would have been proper for *Epiphanius* to have mentioned Infant Baptism, if it had then been in universal use in the Church. For *Epiphanius* gives an account (36) of a Sect, that had began about 100 years before, called the *Hieracites*; who taught that no Infant dying before the use of reason could come to the Kingdom of Heaven. Their reason was, *If any one strive, he is not crowned except he strive lawfully* (37). *How much less can an Infant be crowned, who never strives at all?* They thought of the Kingdom of God in Heaven, as the Antipædobaptists do of his Kingdom on Earth, that it is no state for Babes. Now Mr. *Tombs* thinks that *Epiphanius* among the Arguments he brings that Infants may be glorified, would have pleaded their Baptism, if the baptizing 'em had been usual in the Church.

(36) Hær. 67.

(37) 2 Tim. 2. 5.

But he seems not to have consider'd, that Heretics and Schismatics don't use to be prevailed on by Arguments drawn from the Practice or Doctrines of the Church. And as for Arguments from Scripture, *Epiphanius* uses those that do more expresly and immediately prove their admission into the Kingdom of God; as that saying of our Saviour, *Of such is the Kingdom of God*, &c. and is but short in all.

It might be objected again, that in all probability these Heretics did not Baptize their own Children. If they did, it could be only in prospect of some benefit it might do 'em afterward, if they liv'd. And if they did not baptize 'em, it had been proper for *Epiphanius* to mention that, as a thing wherein they differ'd from the Catholics, supposing that the Catholics did baptize theirs.

But

Year after the Apostles 200.

But upon a more careful reading of their Opinions there rehears'd, it appears that they could have no Children. For one of their Tenets was, that all Marriage and getting of Children is unlawful under the New Testament; and that *no married Person can inherit the Kingdom of God. That the only end of Christ's coming was to settle an absolute Continence. For what new thing did he bring into the World else? Against Malice, Covetousness, Injustice, Fornication,* &c. *the Law had well enough provided before.*

Whether these Men would have Baptized their Children, if they had had any, is uncertain. But the first Body of Men we read of, that did deny Baptism to Infants, which were the *Petrobrusians, Anno Dom.* 1150. did it upon a ground or reason which they held common with these Men, *viz.* that Infants, baptiz'd or not baptiz'd, are incapable of the Kingdom of Heaven; as I shew in the second part of this work, *CH. VII.* §. 5.

1050.

274. (38) Hær. 80.

*Epiphanius* reckons in all 80 Heresies, which he says (3) *were all that he had heard of in the World.* He says nothing of their baptizing or not baptizing Infants. But in the end of his Work he recites the Faith held by the Church, in Opposition to all Heresies. In settling the Article of his Faith he is large; but he has also a few Words concerning the rites of the Church. He mentions the Fasts and Feasts, *&c.* and he adds, *As for the other Ordinances concerning Baptism and the internal mysteries; as the Tradition of the Gospel and of the Apostles is, so they are order'd.* And after some mention of the manner how the Catholic Church uses the Prayers, Psalms, ways of relieving the Poor, *&c.* He adds, *And for Baptism, she* [the Catholic Church] *accounts it to be in Christ* [or, to the Christians] *instead of the old Circumcision.* The like he says in his 8th. Chapter, which is *of the* Epicureans; *the Law had the Patterns of things in it; but the Truth of 'em is in the Gospel. The Law had the Circumcision in the Flesh, serving for a time, till the great Circumcision came, that is, Baptism; which Circumcises us from our Sins, and seals us unto the name of God.*

280.

*Philastrius* makes above 100 Heresies. He makes a difference in Opinion about any trifling matter to be a Heresie. He mentions no dispute about Infant Baptism.

*Theo-*

*Theodoret* has wrote in the beſt Method about Hereſies. He has reduc'd 'em to ſome general Heads. He makes four; the firſt, of thoſe before mentioned, and ſuch others as have denied that the World was made by God. The ſecond, of thoſe that have attributed to our Saviour no other Nature than the Humane. The other two, of other Sects. He ſays, the firſt ſort had at that time hardly any that adhered to them; and the ſecond ſort, none at all. He mentions ſome Sects that uſed no Baptiſm at all, but it was only ſome of the moſt abſurd and impious. But of thoſe that uſed Baptiſm, he has none that renounced Infant Baptiſm. After the four Books of theſe four ſorts of Hereſies, he adds a fifth, which is, *of the True and Orthodox Doctrines and Uſages of the Church.* He mentions there the Baptiſm of Infants, not as a thing diſputed of, or denied by any Sect, but occaſionally; ſhewing the advantages of Baptiſm, that it conveys, not only Pardon for the Sins of Mens former Life, but many other Graces; he proves it by the Baptiſm of Infants, who have committed no Sin. The words I had occaſion to recite before (39). There is another Catalogue of Hereſies at the end of *Tert. de Praeſcript.* But it hath nothing about Baptiſm, ſave that *Menander* ſaid, none could be ſav'd that were not baptiz'd in his name.

Year after the Apoſtles 330.

(39) CH. XIV. §. 4.

Year after the Apostles from 300 to 400.

# CHAP. XXII.

## *Containing references to the Books of some Authors of the next succeeding times.*

§. 1. THis is the best account I can give of the passages concerning Infant Baptism that are in the genuine Books of the Writers that flourished from the Apostles time to the year of Christ 400. The reason that I go no farther, is, because for the next 700 years the matter is clear. Yet of those years and of the *Waldenses* that arose about the year 1150, I intend to discourse something in general in the second part of this Work (40).

1050. (40) Pt. 2. CH. VII.

And here, for the sake of those that have any mind to trace the Quotations for about one hundred year farther, I have set down some references to the places where they are to be found. To set down the words is too long, they being all to the same effect with those already rehearsed.

344. *Prosper*, in almost all his Works against the *Pelagian* and *Semipelagian* Tenets, makes use of the Argument taken from the necessity of the baptizing of Infants. Particularly,

*Epist. ad Augustinum*, prefixed to St. *Austin*'s Book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum.*

*Epist. ad Demetriadem*, among the Works of St. *Ambrose*.

*De vocatione Gentium*, l. 1. c. 16, 22. l. 2. c. 20, 21, 22, 23, *&c.* I know it is question'd whether this be *Prosper*'s, or Pope *Leo*'s, or some other Man's Work, but 'tis much one to this purpose, since whoever he were, he liv'd about this time.

*Carmen de Ingratis*, cap. 1, 6, 21, 30, 31, *&c.*

*Contra Collatorem.*

*Epist.*

| | Year after the Apostles |
|---|---|
| *Epist. ad Rufinum,* circa medium. | |
| *Defensio Augustini.* | |
| *Orosius Apologetic.* | 316. |
| *Paulinus Diaconus, Libello ad Zosimum Papam.* | 320. |
| *Hilarius Arelatensis, Epist. ad Augustinum.* | 330. |
| *Marius Mercator. Commonitorii* c. 1. & 4. | 318. |
| *Præfatione ad Subnotationes.* | |
| *Subnotat.* c. 6. ir. 8. | |
| *Cælestinus Papa, Epist. ad Maximian. apud Acta Concilii Ephesini.* | 323. |
| *Epist. ad Gallos Episcopos.* | |
| *Epistola Synodica Concilii Ephesini ad Cælestinum Papam.* | 331. |
| *Autor Prædestinati, à Sirmondo editus, Par.* 1643. | 335. |
| *Possidius in vitâ Augustini.* | 330. |
| *Autor Hypognosticōn, inter operà Augustini,* l. 4, 5, & passim. | 330. |
| *Isidorus Pelusiota, lib.* 1. *epist.* 125. *l.* 3. *epist.* 195, &c. | 312. |
| *Cassianus, de incarnatione Domini, lib.* 5. *c.* 11. | 324. |
| *Cyrillus in Levitic.* 8. | 312. |
| *Theodoretus in* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. | 323. |
| *Epitome Decret. Divin. lib.* 5. | |
| *Leo magnus Papa, Epist.* 37. *ad Neonem.* | 340. |
| *Epist.* 52. *ad Rusticum, cap.* 16. | |
| *Epist.* 86. *ad Nicetam Aquilejiensem. It. Epist.* 88. *ad Episcopos Germ.* | |

All these were Contemporary with St. *Austin,* but younger than he, and wrote before the year 450. And in the next 50 or 60 years, these following.

| | |
|---|---|
| *Faustus Reiensis.* One of those then called *Semipelagians, de lib. Arbitrio, l.* 1. *c.* 1, 2, 14. | 372. |
| *Gennadius,* One of the same, *de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, c.* 52. | 395. |
| And his Interpolator, a *Roman,* c. 31. | |
| *Fulgentius,* a *Roman, de veritate prædestinationis, l.* 1. *per totum.* | 407. |
| *De Incarnatione & gratiâ Jesu Christi, c.* 15. *it.* 30. | |
| *De Fide ad Petrum, c.* 27, 30, *&c.* | |
| *De remissione peccatorum, l.* 1. *c.* 14. | |
| *Epistola Synodica Episcoporum in Sardiniâ exulum, B. P. Col.* 1618. T. 6. *De prædestinatione & gratiâ, c.* 3. | |
| *Joannes Maxentius. Catholica de Christo Professio, prope finem. B. P. T.* 6. | 420. |

417. The Council of *Gerunda*, Can. 5.

424. The Council of *Ilerda*, Can. 13.

423. *Ferrandus* [a Deacon of *Carthage*] his Letter to *Fulgentius* about the Baptism of a certain *Negro*.

423. *Fulgentius*'s Answer.

The Substance of this last mention'd Letter and the answer to it, is this: A Gentleman of *Carthage* had bought a *Negro* Slave, that had been brought out of the inmost and savage part of *Africa*, where Christianity was not then, nor is yet, known. His Master had caused him to be instructed in the Faith: He was a Catechumen for some time, and at last was admitted among the Competents for Baptism. He had rehearsed in the Congregation the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, *&c.* and had made the usual Renunciations of the Devil, *&c.* as the Custom of that Church was for the Competents to do some days before their Baptism; and at the time of Baptism they used to do it, by way of answer, again. But just before the time in which he was to be baptiz'd, he fell sick of so sudden and violent a Fever, that at the time of Baptism he was speechless, and without sense. They baptiz'd him however. *And we*, says *Ferrandus*, *answer'd in his name, as if it had been for an Infant. And he dying presently after, never understood, I believe, that he was baptiz'd. Now I intreat your Opinion, whether his want of Speech will be no hindrance to his obtaining eternal Salvation. For I am much afraid lest our Lord, to whom all things are possible, did therefore deny him the faculty of Speech, because he thought him unworthy of the benefit of the second Birth. For how that Age of his that was capable of reason, could be cleansed by another's Confession, I do not see. For it is Infants only, who have no Sin but original Sin, whom we believe to be saved by the Faith of those that bring 'em*, &c. *And if it be said, that the Confession he made before, when he was well in his senses, will avail for his forgiveness; I don't see how we can stand to that; for then another will conclude, that he would have been sav'd if he had had no bodily Baptism at all. And at that rate why might we not baptize People after they are dead, if they be such whose devout and faithful purpose was known before? I know the ordinary* Canon (1) *prescribes that sick Persons that are not able to make the answers may be baptized; provided their Friends will at their own peril testifie that they had such*

(1) Concilii Carthag. tertii Can. 34.

*such a purpose before their Sickness. This indeed justifies the Minister in giving the Baptism; but I make some question concerning the benefit that such a Person receives by it.* Year after the Apostles 423.

The answer which the Bishop *Fulgentius* gives to this scruple, tends all toward the comforting *Ferrandus* concerning his doubt of the Man's Salvation. He argues, that all the Condition requir'd by our Saviour for adult Persons, being, that they should *believe and be baptiz'd*; this Man had both. That Faith and the profession of it are the act of the Man: The baptizing him is the act of the Minister. And tho' this Man had not his senses when the Minister perform'd his act, yet he had when he himself perform'd his own. That God's taking away his senses was not so great a sign of his rejecting him, as the continuance of his Life till he could be baptiz'd, was of his receiving him. *'Tis true,* says he, *that we believe none but Infants are saved by the Faith of those that bring 'em,* &c. *and that in the Age of Reason one's own Confession is requir'd,* &c. *But this Man had his senses when he professed, and he had yet Life when he was baptiz'd.*

He grants in the following discourse that if he had died before he had been actually baptiz'd, he could not have been saved; which is very hard, and contrary to the determination of St. *Ambrose* and other Fathers in a like Case, as I shew in my second Part (2).

(2) CH. III. §. 3. it. CH. VI. §. 3.

The reason why I recite this at large, rather than the other passages to which I have given references, is not that this speaks more plainly than the rest about Infant Baptism; on the contrary, the rest speak more directly to that Matter than this does. But I recite it, that the earnest concern that this Master, and Minister, and Bishop do shew for the Salvation of this poor Slave may fly in the Face, and strike with shame and terror the Consciences, of such prophane Traders of our Nation, as having Plantations in the *West-Indies*, do keep hundreds of such *Negroes*, and are so far from any concern for their Souls, that on the contrary they do all they can to hinder 'em from Christian Faith and Baptism, and discourage those that would procure 'em means of it.

I do not conceive that all the Masters there are of this temper; but for those that are, and are resolv'd to continue so; as I doubt they have but little belief of the

Year after the Apostles 423. truth of the Scripture, so it were for their interest that it were not true. For there is nothing plainer by the Tenor of it than that such Masters are in God's sense a much worse sort of Heathens than their Slaves, and liable to a far greater Condemnation; and that, beside their own Personal Sins, the blood of those poor Creatures will be requir'd at their hands. I would crave leave to recommend to these Gentlemen the reading of a little Book, publish'd about 20 years ago, by a Clergyman that had liv'd in *Barbados*, call'd, *The* Negroe's *and* Indian's *Advocate.*

That I may tell the Reader in short the Substance of the places to which I have referr'd him, they do all speak of Infant Baptism, as of a thing taken for granted; and those of 'em that do at all enlarge on the Matter, do speak of it as absolutely necessary to the Infants obtaining the Kingdom of Heaven. And this, whether they be of the *Prædestinarian*, or *Semipelagian* Opinion. And
1050. I am confident there is no passage in any Author from this time to the year of Christ 1150, or thereabouts,
750. that speaks against it; save that *Walafridus Strabo*, about the year 850 (tho' he were for Infant Baptism, and thought it necessary for their Salvation, yet) gave his singular Opinion, that it had not been practis'd from the beginning, but had come into use first in St. *Austin*'s time; which, how palpable a Mistake it was, I suppose every Reader is by this time satisfied. I give you his Words hereafter (3).

(3) Pt. 2. CH. II. §. 2.

CHAP.

# CHAP. XXIII.

## *Quotations out of some Books that are spurious, i. e. were not written by those whose Name they bear, but yet are proved to be Ancient.*

§. 1. LEt the first of these be that out of the Book called *Clement's Constitutions*; they are called his, because he is feigned to have been the Compiler of 'em from the Mouths of the *Apostles.* The History of which Book, as near as Learned Men have traced it, is this,

There were in the very early times certain Traditionary Accounts handed about as the Preachings, Doctrines, or Rules that had been deliver'd by such or such an Apostle or Apostolical Man; something like the Short-hand Notes of Sermons, which it was the late Custom in *England* to take from the Mouths of Celebrated Preachers: One of which would be called for Example Διδαχὴ Πέτρου, *the Doctrine of* Peter: Another Διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος, the *Preaching of* Clement, &c. And several of these being by some studious Persons Collected and put together, were intitl'd Διατάξεις Αποσόλων, The *Rules*, or, *Constitutions of the Apostles.*

If they had been all of 'em Judicious and Sincere Persons that first took these Notes of the Preachings or Sayings of the Apostles, and they that Collected 'em into Volumes had been the like, there is no doubt but the Collections would have been highly valuable; and as they are, they do for the most part consist of Pious Rules and Exhortations. But according to the various Memories, or Judgment, or Honesty of the first Recorders, or after-Compilers, these Compositions were in many things various, uncertain, and by Men of different Inclinations differently interpolated, and so of no Authority.

220. In *Eusebius*'s time, *Anno* 320, there was a Volume of
270. this Nature, called Διδαχαὶ Ἀποστόλων, *Doctrines of the*
(1) H. E. l. *Apostles*; which he reckons (1) among the spurious
3. c. 25. Books. *Epiphanius*, 50 years after, cites a Book call'd,
300. *Constitutions of the Apostles*; which he says was of doubtful Credit; and it has also been alter'd since his time. About the year 400 it seems to have been licked and brought into that form of Eight Books, in which we now have it, and to have been set forth with that confident Title, as if the whole had been put into form by St. *Clement.* This is confirm'd by the Quotations of it by the Author of the *Opus imperfect. in Mat.* who liv'd about that time.

Hence it appears that for any particular Clause or Chapter of it, one does not know how long, or how little while before the year 400 it has been inserted. The Clause to the present purpose, is this,

## *Constitut. Apostolic. lib.* 6. *cap.* 15.

The Apostles are there brought in speaking, and after they have disallowed of such as baptize twice, and also set forth the Wickedness of those that despise all Baptism: They say,

*And he that says,* I will be baptiz'd when I am going to die, that I may not sin after it, and defile my Baptism; *such a Man has no true knowledge of God, and is ignorant of his Nature. For,* Delay not thou to turn to the Lord; for thou knowest not what to Morrow will bring forth.

And then they add,

Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Θεοῦ. Ἄφετε γὰρ φησὶ, τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά.

*And baptize your Infants, and bring them up in the Nurture and Admonition of God; for he says,* Suffer the little Children to come to me, and forbid 'em not.

How little Assurance soever there is from the Credit of this Book, that these are the Apostles Words; yet they shew that it was the received Doctrine at the time when they were put into the Book.

§. 2.

§. 2. The Quotation of the Book of *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* is commonly thought worth the while by those that write on this Subject. Otherwise I for my part should hardly think it worth the setting down. Year after the Apostles 300.

Partly because of the Abhorrence one should have of so gross and impudent a Forger, who having, about the year 400, if not later, compos'd some Books remarkable for nothing but affected high-flown Expressions, thought them fit to be Father'd upon *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* mention'd *Acts* 17. 34. Unless we are to think that the Author himself was not guilty of this Imposture; but that some body else having got the Copies of these Books into his hands, did thrust in here and there a Sentence which should represent that *Dionysius* as the Author, which I have sometimes thought. 300.

And partly because what he says on this Subject seems to me spoken with less Judgment than usual; towring in Words, but shallow in Sense.

I shall forbear setting down the original (for it is not worth reciting twice) only give the Translation of his Bombast *Greek* in as plain *English* as I can.

He in this Treatise gives an account of the several Rites used at the Eucharist, at Ordinations, *&c.* and among the rest at Baptism (which he generally calls by the name of the *Divine Birth*) and of the reasons of 'em. What he has of Baptism does mostly concern the Baptism of the adult, and their Professions. What he says of the Baptism of Infants, is in Answer to the Objections the Heathens made against it, and is as follows.

## *Ecclesiastic. Hierarch. cap. 7. in fine.*

*But that Children also, who cannot yet understand the Divine Mysteries, should be made partakers of the Divine Birth, and of the most sacred signs of Society with God, do seem, as you say, to Men that are prophane and ill-affected to our Religion, a thing fit to be laught at: That the Bishops should teach the holy things to those that are incapable of 'em, and should bestow the things which by Sacred Tradition they have received, upon such as have no sense of 'em. And, what is more ridiculous, that others should pronounce the Renunciations and holy Professions for them, in such a fashion as if they were doing it for themselves.*

Now

Year after the Apostles 300.

*Now your Episcopal Wisdom ought not to be angry with those that are in error, but to Answer their Objections with a Religious Meekness for their Instruction and Edification; adding this also as from our Holy Religion, that our knowledge is not able to comprehend all Divine things; and that a great many things which we cannot understand, have really reasons that are worthy of God, unknown to us, but known to the higher Beings; and even those higher Natures are ignorant of many things which are known only to the All-wise Deity, the Author of all Wisdom.*

*And yet, as to this particular matter, that we do say the same things which our Divine Ministers of holy things have deliver'd down to us as they were taught 'em from* Ancient Tradition. *For they say, and it is true, that Children, if they be brought up to holy Rules and Institutions, will come to be of a good temper of Mind, free, and disentangled from all error, and out of the danger of an unclean Life. Our Divine Instructors considering this, have thought fit that Children should be admitted after this holy manner.*

*That the natural Parents of the Child which is brought should deliver him to some one that is himself baptiz'd, as to a good Instructor in the things of God; and that the Child should afterward learn of him, as of his Father in God, and his Sponsor in things that are for Salvation. And then of this Person who undertakes to instruct the Child in holiness of Life the Bishop does demand, as I may call it, the Declaration of his Renouncing, and the other holy Professions. Not that he does (as they jeeringly represent it) initiate the one in the others stead in the holy Rites. For he does not say thus,* 'I do in the stead of this Child renounce or promise, *&c. But,* this Child does renounce, 'profess, *&c.* that is, I promise to persuade this Child, 'when he shall come of Age to understand the holy 'Things, by my religious Instructions, to renounce the 'adverse Powers, and keep clear from them, and to 'profess and fulfill the Divine Proposals.

*It is therefore, as far as I can see, no absurdity that the Child should be enter'd into the Divine Life; whenas he has a Guide and Sponsor that will instruct him in the knowledge of Divine things, and keep him safe from the adverse Powers. And the Bishop does make the Child partaker of the holy Mysteries, that he may be educated according to them, and may lead no other Life but such as has always a regard to those Divine things, and an Agreement with them,*

*them, and is in a holy manner habituated to 'em. And to this he is led by his Divine Sponsor.*

Year after the Apostles 300.

His mentioning *Ancient Tradition* in this matter, would make one think what I hinted before, that the Author had no purpose of putting on the vizor of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*; for to make him talk of Ancient Tradition in any thing of Christianity which was all new in his time, was to betray his own cheat. Beside, it is not in this Book of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, that there are any Tokens of its being written by *Dionysius*, but only in some of the other Books of the same Author.

The Interpretation he gives of the Professions made by the Godfathers is very singular, he will not have it that the Godfather does renounce, profess, &c. in the Child's name or stead. But both the Ancients generally and the Moderns, do so understand it as that he does. But perhaps both of these may be reconcil'd. The Godfather does not profess in the Child's stead, so as that the Godfather's performance of those Professions should be in stead of the Child's performance of 'em; and in this sense this Author denies it. But the Godfather does profess in the Child's stead, so as to declare the Obligation of the Child to perform, and does in his name own that obligation, and make the promise: And in this sense the other Ancients affirm it. To the intent it may more fully be declar'd that the benefits of Baptism are convey'd to the Child not absolutely, but on Condition that if he live, he do perform his part of the Covenant, the Godfather expresses those things that are the Child's part: As if a great Benefactor will settle a large Estate of Inheritance on a Child, upon condition that he pay a small quit-rent in acknowledgment; this is so beneficial to the Child that there ought to be no doubt of his Acceptance; the Contract is therefore made in the Child's name; and because he is not of Age, his Guardian Seals it in his stead. This the Church of *England* does more plainly express, who puts the words thus, *Dost thou in the name of this Child renounce, &c?* And so did the Ancients, who put 'em thus, *Does this Child renounce*, &c?

As for the Age in which these Books were written, it is best gather'd from *Photius*, who gives the Abstract of a Book written by *Theodorus Presbyter* wherein he pretended to maintain that these Books are the Genuine Work

of

Year after the Apostles 300.

of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, against some that then op-pos'd the Authenticalness of 'em. The Man must have had a hard Task. But yet it is a proof that they were known then, and for some time before. This *Theodorus* liv'd, as Dr. *Hammond* says, (2) *Anno* 420, but others place him much later, in the 7th Century.

(2) Six Queries. Infant Baptism.

§. 3. There does not lie any such prejudice for any design of Forgery against the Author of the *Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos* which commonly go among the Works of *Justin Martyr*; only that piece going about, as it seems, without the name of the Author, some body in the early times ascribed it to him. It cannot be his, because it makes mention of *Irenæus*, and of *Origen*, who liv'd something after his time; unless those passages that mention *Irenæus* and *Origen* have been since the first writing of the Book foisted into it. I shall not pretend to guess at the time of the writing of it; only it is known to be Ancient. The passage I would quote is this,

*Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos, quæst.* 56.

Ἐι τὰ τελευτῶντα βρέφη ἐπαινον ἢ μέμψιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξ ἔργων, τίς ἡ διαφορὰ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν ὑπὸ ἄλλων μὲν βαπτισθέντων καὶ μηδὲν πραξάντων, καὶ τῶν μὴ βαπτισθέντων καὶ ὁμοίως μηδὲν πραξάντων;

Απόκρισις.

Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν βαπτισθέντων πρὸς τὰ μὴ βαπτισθέντα, τὸ τυχεῖν μὲν τὰ βαπτισθέντα τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν, τὰ δὲ μὴ βαπτισθέντα μὴ τυχεῖν. Ἀξιοῦνται δὲ τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων αὐτὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι.

Question.

*Since Children that die in Infancy have no praise nor no blame from any thing that they have done, what difference will be made at the Resurrection between such of them as have been by the means of others baptiz'd but have done nothing themselves, and such as have not been baptiz'd and have likewise done nothing?*

Answ.

Answer.

*This will be the difference between those that have been baptiz'd, and those that have not; that the baptized will be made partakers of the blessings granted by Baptism; and the unbaptiz'd not. And these Blessings of Baptism are vouchsafed to 'em for the sake of the Faith of those that bring 'em to Baptism.*

He speaks of the case of unbaptized Infants after the rate that most *Greek* Writers do, *viz.* That they will lose all Reward, without mentioning any positive Punishment. This was the general Opinion of the Christians of the *Greek Church*, that Infants dying unbaptized would miss of Heaven, but not be under any positive Punishment, as appears by the Words of *Greg. Nazianzen* cited before, (3) and as I shall more fully shew at another place (4).

There is a spurious Book ascribed to *Athanasius*, call'd *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, which gives their Opinion in this matter very particularly. Some Quotations out of that Book ought to have had a place here, but that it seems to have been written after our period, and by ignorant Men crowded in among the Works of *Athanasius*. But the following passage I recite because of its affinity to the foregoing.

(3) CH. XI. §. 6.

(4) Pt. 2. CH. VI. §. 4.

*Quæst. ad Antiochum, qu.* 114.

Πῶ ὑπάγεσι τὰ τελευτῶντα νήπια; εἰς κόλασιν, ἢ εἰς βασιλείαν; καὶ πῶ τὰ τῶν ἀπίστων νήπια; καὶ πῶ τὰ τῶν πιστῶν ἀβάπτιστα ἀποθνήσκοντα τάττονται; μετὰ τῶν πιστῶν, ἢ ἀπίστων;

Ἀπόκρισις.

Τῷ κυρίῳ λέγοντος. Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς μὲ, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. καὶ πάλιν τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ φάσκοντος. νῦν δὲ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἅγια ἐστι. Πρόδηλον ὅτι ὡς ἄσπιλα καὶ πιστὰ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται τὰ τῶν πιστῶν βεβαπτισμένα νήπια. Τὰ δὲ ἀβάπτιστα καὶ τὰ ἐθνικὰ οὔτε εἰς βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται: ἀλλ' οὔτε πάλιν εἰς κόλασιν. Ἀμαρτίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἔπραξαν.

Question,

Year after the Apostles 300.

Question.

*Whither do Infants go when they die, into Punishment, or into the Kingdom? And particularly whither go the Children of Heathens? And where are placed the Children of the faithful that die unbaptized? Are they placed with the Believers, or with the Unbelievers?*

Answer.

*Inasmuch as our Lord says,* Suffer little Children to come to me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven; *and again the Apostle says,* Now are your Children Holy [or Saints,] *it is plain that the Children of Believers do, if they be baptized, go as spotless and faithful into the Kingdom. But those of 'em that are not baptiz'd, do not enter the Kingdom, as also neither do the Children of Unbelievers. But yet neither on the other side do they go into Torment; for they have committed no Sin.*

They that would read any more of those spurious passages that are later than the year 400, but ascribed to Authors before that time, and yet are not very scandalous, as being really within a Century of it, or thereabouts, in which there happens to be mention of Infant Baptism, may have some of 'em in the said Book.

*Athanasii Quæstiones ad Antiochum. quæst. 2. it. qu. 66.* And also,

*Athanasii Dicta & interpretatio Parabolarum Script. qu. 94.* And more in Books ascribed to St. *Chrysostom,* as *Chrysostom in psal. 14. One brings an Infant to be baptiz'd; presently the Priest requires a Covenant,* &c. *Idem, Homiliâ de Adam & Evâ. Let us consider the meaning of what the Church all over the World practises in the baptizing of Infants or adult Persons,* &c.

There is also commonly produc'd a passage very Ancient indeed, if one might relie upon it, an Order of *Hyginus,* Bishop of *Rome*; That *in all Baptisms there must be one* [Patrinus] *Godfather, and one Godmother.* But as this is of no Credit for Authenticalness, having no voucher elder than *Platina* (5); so also it does not necessarily relate to Infants; for they had Witnesses that are sometimes called *Patrini,* in the Case of adult Persons.

22. 1374.

(5) In vitâ Hygini.

This sort of Testimonies is better omitted; for in any cause whatever, Evidences of no good Credit do more hurt than good.

*The End of the First Part.*

1 Cor. 15: 29. expl. — — 298